

## HOW CRANMER "REVISED" THE SARUM MISSAL

CATHOLIC interest in the proposed revision of the liturgy of the Anglican Church, of which the National Assembly has given a "general approval" and which is now in process of being discussed in detail, centres in the revelation thereby afforded of the parlous state of the Establishment. When Bishop contends with Bishop as to the contents and meaning of the Anglican creed, what wonder that the "Ecclesia discens" joins whole-heartedly in the fray, and that all the various sects, united merely by their legal constitution and called euphemistically "schools of thought," betray their deep-seated divergencies. Prayer naturally follows belief: we adore Christ because we believe Him divine; we invoke Our Lady and the Saints because we believe in their power of intercession; we pray for the souls in Purgatory because we believe that our prayers can help them. Accordingly, common prayer must be based on common belief, and it is precisely because there is no common belief amongst Anglicans that all this trouble about the Book of Common Prayer has arisen. A revised Prayer-Book, which would assume only those points of faith that are shared by all "schools of thought" in the English Church, would be a very small volume indeed and contain very little that was distinctively Christian. Hence the desperate remedy of "alternative uses"<sup>1</sup> embodying different beliefs, and thereby proclaiming the Church of England to be what Catholics have always known her—a State-creation, the work of man's hands, without authority to teach and only deriving her authority to rule from the State which made her. No authority that does not speak in the name of God can define infallibly, and therefore impose acceptance of, the truths that God has revealed. Hence the impossibility of establishing in the Church of England a uniform code of worship, for that Church, in spite of the aid of the secular

<sup>1</sup> This suicidal policy, which would embody in the very formularies of the Anglican Church the confession that she teaches different doctrines, is, strangely enough, favoured by the *Church Times* (April 20th, leader) as the only possible solution of the crisis.

power, has never been able to secure the necessary prerequisite—uniformity of belief.

The attempt, as we know, was made under Edward, under Elizabeth, and under Charles II. The Prayer-Books of 1549 (1st Edward), of 1552 (2nd Edward), of 1559 (Elizabeth), and of 1662 (Charles) were the results. Why any objection should be taken to the revision of a Book so frequently revised before, why Cranmer and the Caroline divines should be supposed to have said the last word on Anglican liturgy, whereas their successors in the Episcopate have the same power, or—since the setting up of the National Assembly—even more, to alter and amend the forms of worship in the State Church, is apt to puzzle the outsider until he realizes that the contest is in essence about points of doctrine. The old-fashioned Protestants are in deadly fear lest, under pretence of bringing the liturgy "up-to-date," something more than revising the English and excising strong passages from the Psalms may be accomplished, viz., the recognition of the Communion Service as a sacrifice, with all that such recognition implies; that is, the restoration of the Mass as the main feature of Anglican worship.

That being so, it may be of interest to recall, using the classic researches of Gasquet and Bishop<sup>1</sup> as a basis, what exactly Cranmer did when he turned the Sarum Missal into the Book of Common Prayer. We know what he did with the Ordination service, for the Holy See, by an irreformable judgment, has decided that that rite, mutilated to express the heretical mind of Cranmer, is incapable of conferring the Sacrament.<sup>2</sup> The same heretical mind was at work, as we shall see, even in the first "revision" of the Sarum Missal, in order to abolish the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Before examining what Cranmer did to the Sarum Missal, a word must be said in explanation of the Sarum Missal itself. In the Middle Ages nearly every cathedral in England celebrated the Mass according to its own "use" or local adaptation of the Roman rite. The neighbouring parish churches followed the model set by their cathedral. But, as many of the English sees had a monastic cathedral, and as Religious Orders followed a use peculiar to themselves, it would often happen that the secular clergy of a

<sup>1</sup> *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* (Hodges).

<sup>2</sup> For a convenient summary of the argument against Anglican Orders see *What Cranmer meant to do and did*, by Father Joseph Rickaby (C.T.S.: 1d.).

parish church would have to adopt the use of some secular cathedral outside their own diocese. For reasons which it is unnecessary to discuss here, most of the secular clergy adopted the use of Salisbury Cathedral. This Sarum Missal was originally compiled, shortly after the Norman Conquest, by St. Osmund, a Norman, Bishop of Salisbury, or Sarum. It represents in the main the Roman rite of the eleventh century, with the addition of a few Norman customs. The Sarum priest recited in the sacristy, while vesting, the Psalm "Judica," the "Pater" and "Ave." At the foot of the altar he used a shortened form of the Confiteor, like that of the Dominicans, followed by the "Misereatur vestri." Wine and water were put into the chalice before the Gospel; and at the offertory chalice and Host were offered together, with the prayers "Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas" and "In spiritu humilitatis." After the Lavabo the priest said "Orate fratres et sorores." From the preface onward, through the Canon, the Sarum Mass was word for word and gesture by gesture that of our Missals to-day, except that a profound inclination took the place of the genuflection, and after the Elevation the priest stood with arms outstretched in the form of a cross. At High Mass, a ritual fan, made of rich materials, was waved over the celebrant by a deacon. Before his Communion the priest said this prayer, peculiar to the Sarum use:

Ave in æternum, sanctissima caro Christi, mihi ante omnia et super omnia summa dulcedo. Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi sit mihi peccatori via et vita. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.<sup>1</sup>

Such, in brief, was the Sarum "use," which, at the death of Henry VIII. (January 28, 1547), was as yet intact. Bishop Gardiner celebrated a solemn requiem according to Sarum for that monarch on the day of his funeral. But the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist had long been denied by the Continental Reformers, and the new teaching had filtered into England and given occasion to violent discussions as to the manner of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Among the lowest classes the profane had been quick to seize the opportunity for revolting blasphemies.

<sup>1</sup> Hail for evermore, thou most holy flesh of Christ, sweet to me before and beyond all things beside. To me a sinner may the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ be the Way and the Life. In the Name, etc.

Ribald men were applying such blasphemous epithets to the Blessed Sacrament as "Jack-in-the-Box," "the Sacrament of the Halter"<sup>1</sup>; and the sacred words of Consecration, "Hoc est Corpus," had been corrupted into "Hocus Pocus," as the refrain of popular ballads.<sup>2</sup>

Naturally such profanities gravely shocked the conscience of the people, who, in spite of their confused notions about the authority of the Pope, still retained their devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, and there was an outcry of resentment. Somerset and Cranmer saw in this popular disturbance a means for advancing their own ends. Promptly (November, 1547) they introduced into Parliament a "Bill for the Sacrament of the Altar," to suppress the growing irreverence to the Blessed Sacrament. Towards the end of the month, after the second reading of this Bill, which met with great favour from the Catholic-minded party, they tacked on to it a clause providing for the administration of Communion under both kinds, as being conformable to the primitive practice of the Church. After some difficulty the Bill was passed, and in the following March (1548) Cranmer drew up the Order of Communion, a ritual in English for the communion of the laity under both kinds, to be inserted in the Latin Mass. It contained a part called the "Warning of Communion," which shows Cranmer's ultimate aim. Some days before the Communion a notice must be read out, stating on what day "the parson intends to administer it." Communion was to be restricted to Sundays and Holydays. By this subtle and specious innovation Cranmer paved the way for the abolition of Masses at which there were no communicants. That it was only a preparation for more radical changes is seen from contemporary documents. There is extant a document in Cranmer's own handwriting,<sup>3</sup> containing a series of questions submitted to the bishops of England at the very time that the Order of Communion was being written. The questions are tentative and are evidently meant to sound the bishops as to how far it was expedient to go in the matter of the abolition of the Mass. One question begins thus in Cranmer's hand: "Whether it be convenient the accustomed . . ." This is struck out, and over it is written "What is the Mass?" This is again struck

<sup>1</sup> Nichols, *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*.

<sup>2</sup> Froude, *The Reign of Edward VI.*

<sup>3</sup> C.C.C.C.: MS. 105. Quoted by Gasquet and Bishop.



out, and changed into "Wherein consisteth the Mass by Christ's institution?"

The other questions may be summed up thus: "What is the Mass for? for sacrifice or communion?" "Shall we do away with the Mass offered for the living and the dead, as distinct from Communion?" "Should the Gospel be explained at the Mass to the people?" "Should the Mass be in English?" The answers given by the bishops to these questions are of great importance. The Henricians replied in the Catholic sense, Bonner and five others submitting a joint answer; but Cranmer, whose mind was most probably made up when he framed the questions, gives clear, laconic answer in the plain Lutheran sense. He writes that the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a memory and representation of the sacrifice of the Cross. The Mass had no virtue of itself, its virtue being limited to the reception of the Sacrament. Mass offered for the living and the dead, apart from Communion, should not be allowed to continue.

While this questionnaire was being answered, Somerset and Cranmer made use of the pulpit to bring about a change in public opinion favourable to the reforms at which they were aiming. Latimer, for instance, preached his famous Plough Sermon at St. Paul's (January 18, 1548)<sup>1</sup>:

Where the devil is resident, and hath his plough going, down with Christ's cross, up with superstition and idolatry. This is the mark at which the devil shooteth, to evacuate the Cross of Christ. These 1,500 years he hath been a doer, only purposing to evacuate Christ's death and to make it of small efficacy and virtue. For whereas Christ would be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in him should have salvation, the devil would none of that: they would have us saved by a daily oblation propitiatory, by a sacrifice expiatory, or remissory.

Meanwhile the land was flooded with pamphlets, dedicated to the King and the Lord Protector, stigmatizing the Mass as wicked and devilish. The time seemed now ripe for Cranmer to take the step he had long been meditating. The Order of Communion of 1548 had been adopted by some in its entirety, by others in part, by others not at all, and everything was in confusion. The Government decided to remedy the confusion by a "uniform, quiet and godly

<sup>1</sup> Latimer "Sermons." Parker Soc., pp. 70-73.

order, rite and fashion, of common and open prayer and administration of the Sacraments." This was the first Book of Common Prayer, in the inspiration and composition of which Cranmer had the chief part. On its completion, the Book was presented to Parliament and debated in the Lords. Of this debate, which began on December 15, 1548, and lasted four days, full notes are preserved in the Royal MS. in the British Museum, unique of their kind and first brought to light by Gasquet and Bishop.<sup>1</sup> After some irregular discussion about the Bill in general, Somerset "commanded the Bishops to fall to some point, and willed them to dispute whether bread be in the Sacrament after the Consecration, or not." The account of the debate reads, in some respects, like one of the weekly scholastic disputations in a theological seminary. Quotations from the early Fathers, familiar to anyone who has done the scholastic treatise, "*De Eucharistia*," were hurled from one bishop to another, to be rebutted by other quotations from a different part of the same work. Both sides appealed to St. Augustine in support of their own doctrine. The Bishop of Bath cited a passage from "*Sermo 272*," which seems against the real presence: "*Fecit corpus suum, id est figuram corporis sui*." Thirlby of Westminster quoted from the "*Enarratio in Psalmum 98*," the passage "*Adorate scabellum pedum. Terra est scabellum. Caro significat terram*," which proves that the Blessed Sacrament is to be adored. St. John Damascene, St. Chrysostom, Theophilact, Eusebius, St. Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, are all quoted. Cranmer made a long speech in defence of a virtual presence:

They be two things, to eat the Sacrament, and to eat the Body of Christ. The eating of the Body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be, although a man never taste the Sacrament. The wicked eat the Sacrament. But the wicked eat not the Body of Christ, but their own condemnation.

Therefore the Sacrament is not the body of Christ. Tunstall, in reply, instead of distinguishing the above premisses, gave the argument from Scripture: "His body is in bread and wine, because God hath spoken it, which is able to do it, saying 'This is my body.'" Cranmer at once retorted: "If the evil man eat his body, he hath life everlasting." They did not argue in strict scholastic form, and consequently

<sup>1</sup> Royal MS. 17B. xxxix., cf. Gasquet and Bishop. Appendix V.

never kept to one point at a time. Occasionally Somerset interrupted in anger, urging the bishops to agree to the Book. But no agreement was reached. One interesting remark made by Thirlby of Westminster shows that the Book had been tampered with after it had been first presented to receive the bishops' signatures. The word "Oblation," which was in it then, had been removed.

After the debate had lasted four days the Book of Common Prayer was passed. Of the bishops thirteen were favourable, ten unfavourable, and four absent. It was embodied in the Act of Uniformity and became law on Whit-Sunday, 1549.

It is one of the most momentous documents in the ecclesiastical history of England, as it displaced, for the first time, the liturgy which had been followed ever since the conversion of England to Christianity. It is a compromise, and still marks only an intermediary stage. Entirely Lutheran in spirit, it keeps as much as possible of the Sarum form to avoid giving too great a shock to the people. The manifest aim was to remove the sacrificial character of the Mass. First, the name is changed. The new title is: "The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion commonly called the Mass." Notice is to be given beforehand of intending communicants, and no service is to be held unless there are communicants. "The priest shall wear a white alb, plain, with a vestment, or a cope," *i.e.*, the use of the ordinary vestments is made optional. The service was opened by the clerks' singing in English, for the Introit, a Psalm appointed for the day. In this particular point Cranmer could claim a return to a more ancient usage, for originally the Introit of the Mass was a whole Psalm, cut down in the eighth or ninth century to two or three verses. The Confiteor, regarded by Lutherans as a preparation for sacrifice, was omitted. Instead of the "Judica," the priest recites the Lord's Prayer (as in the Sarum Missal) and a collect. Kyrie, Gloria, Collects, Epistle, Gospel, and Credo, are all retained, because these prayers indicate praise and thanksgiving and not specially sacrifice. At this point occurs a distinct break. In the Sarum use the priest is directed to lift up Chalice and Host in both hands, offering the sacrifice to the Lord, reciting the two sacrificial prayers, "Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas" and "In spiritu humilitatis." These prayers and gestures were entirely suppressed. The priest

was simply to place the bread and wine on the altar without any ceremony. For the notion of oblation was substituted the collecting of money for the poor man's box, and verses of Scripture appropriate to almsdeeds were sung. In this way the word "Offertory" has come to mean in English "a collection"—a sense wanting to the word in other languages.

After this, "so many as shall be partakers of Holy Communion shall tarry in the choir, all the rest departing"—a rubric which seems to compare non-Communicants to Catechumens, excluded from the "Missa Fidelium." The Preface and Sanctus then followed as in the Sarum Missal. We now enter upon the Canon, which with the exception of one short clause added by St. Gregory, has remained practically unchanged for 1,300 years. Cranmer dared not suppress this hallowed prayer, but considerably modified it. The ancient rubrics of the Canon were all swept away, and the following substituted:

- (1) The prayer shall be said or sung plainly and distinctly;
- (2) there shall be no elevation, or showing of the host to the people;
- (3) the elements shall be taken into the hands by the communicants.

All the phrases of the Canon indicative of sacrifice were changed. In the "Te igitur" the words "haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia" were converted into "these *prayers* which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty." In the Memento for the Living the words "pro quibus tibi offerimus hoc sacrificium" are changed into "We commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation which is here assembled, to celebrate the commemoration of the death of thy most glorious son." Instead of "Hanc igitur oblationem" there is quite a different prayer:

O God, Heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by His *one* oblation, *once* made) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world . . . etc.

In the "Quam oblationem," instead of the words "ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis *fiat* dilectissimi Filii Tui,"<sup>1</sup> these

<sup>1</sup> "that they [the elements of bread and wine] may become for us the Body and Blood of thy Best Beloved Son."

ambiguous words, capable of expressing either a real or only a virtual presence, are put: "that they *may be unto us* the Body and Blood of thy Son."

The Consecration prayer, "*Qui pridie*," was substantially unchanged.

In the prayer "*Unde et memores*," where Sarum has "*hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam*," the new service has "we offer unto Thee *ourselves*, our souls, and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee." All reference to the sacrifice of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech was omitted. Other new, and certainly very beautiful prayers were inserted here, expressing the idea of oblation, but it is only the oblation of the Faithful, united by faith and love to Christ, and not the oblation of Jesus Christ Himself. There was no commingling of the sacred elements. The remaining deviations from the Sarum Missal have no special significance.

The above equivocal service, meant to satisfy the Lutheran without being quite intolerable to the Catholic, naturally failed to satisfy either. Many even of the London parishes refused to conform; Oxford and Cambridge clung to the heritage of the past; open rebellion broke out in Devon and Cornwall. On the other hand, Peter Martyr, Bullinger and their followers were displeased at the amount of Popery in the new service. As a measure of Uniformity it was a conspicuous failure, for it produced the greater diversity. Bishop Gardiner's attitude was curious. "He adopted the policy, whether rightly or wrongly [says Cardinal Gasquet] of contesting every inch of ground with the innovators, and putting a Catholic, even if a strained, interpretation upon the words of the new service." A strenuous upholder of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, he maintained that the Book of Common Prayer was in accordance with these doctrines. The intercession for the living and the dead he understands as a sign that the new service is a propitiatory sacrifice. In the prayer before the Consecration, the priest asks "that these creatures of bread and wine *be to us* the Body and Blood of Christ." "They cannot be," says Gardiner, "unless God worketh it and maketh them so to be." In other words, Gardiner openly taught that the new rite indicated Transubstantiation as truly as the Sarum rite.

This interpretation of Gardiner's brought matters to a

head. Cranmer was driven to repudiate Gardiner's teaching by a more definite move towards Protestantism; and in view of the confusion and dissension caused by the Service Book of 1549, he thought that by 1552 the time had come to go the full length of the Continental reformers. The final step was now taken. The Sarum Missal was changed beyond all possibility of recognition, without any attempt at compromise, and without leaving any possible loophole for Catholic-minded bishops. Everything in the first book upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence of Catholic doctrine was swept away. The Introit was abolished, the Gloria was transferred to the end of the service, the Kyrie was altered and embedded in the Ten Commandments. The intercession for the living and the dead, and the prayer for the sanctification of the creatures of bread and wine, on which Gardiner based his argument, were expunged. In fact, of the Canon little more was left than the words of institution. Nothing of the Sarum rite remained save the Collect, Epistle, Gospel, and Creed. No provision was made as to the time of placing the bread and wine on the table, and ordinary bread was to be used instead of unleavened bread. The table for Communion was to stand in the body of the church, and the minister was to stand at the north side of the table in order to banish all idea of a sacrificial altar. The "Black Rubric" was introduced to explain, lest the kneeling for Communion should by any persons, either out of ignorance or infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved:

That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental bread and wine remain still in their natural substances; and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

This second Prayer Book was of course swept away by Queen Mary, but was revived by Elizabeth, with slight alterations, in 1559, disappeared again during the Commonwealth, was restored at the Restoration, and reimposed without material change in 1662. The ridiculous story that the



Pope, if his supremacy were again recognized by the Queen, would have approved Elizabeth's Prayer Book, repeated though it is in many Protestant "histories," is repudiated by all responsible historians, non-Catholic as well as Catholic.<sup>1</sup> That Book was essentially and irredeemably heretical, and it remains to-day the liturgy of Anglicanism.

Thus was abolished the hallowed rite which had been the mainspring of religious life in England for a thousand years. The same hand and brain drew up the mutilated Ordination Service, from which all reference to the power of offering sacrifice was deliberately removed. In addition, then, to the evidence afforded by the contents of the Ordinal, Cranmer's treatment of the Sarum Missal makes it abundantly clear that he meant positively to exclude, and succeeded in excluding, from the Ordinal the intention of consecrating a sacrificing priesthood.

CLEMENT TIGAR.

<sup>1</sup> See "The alleged Papal approval of the Anglican Liturgy," by J. H. Pollen, S.J., *THE MONTH*, Sept. 1902, pp. 274 sqq.

## CONTINUITY ?

OUR Archæological Rambling Club consists of twenty members; two-thirds of these generally appear at our Saturday meetings. We meet at some given place within thirty miles of London to "explore"—as the phrase of Jane Austen's day had it—from thence. The scheme is excellent; the rules are excellent; the members are excellent. The only drawback is that we are dull. We are so obviously gathered together to acquire "valuable knowledge." Some of us find this a task involving much mental toil and many irrelevant questions. Others lend a deaf ear to their teacher of the moment, and apply themselves entirely to enlightening their ignorant fellow-members in what is meant to be, but is not, a well-modulated voice. The result is generally a confused and rather breathless dullness. Breathless, because ancient buildings are often airless, and also because the learned are in such haste to edify the unlearned that they are soon "spent"—a much better word, by the way, than our hard-worked "exhausted."

But there is one of us who is never a teacher, never "spent" and never dull. He could not be dull; he has "vision." And at times he can show to others what he sees himself.

Last Saturday we were in a Hertfordshire church. It had the usual swept and garnished air. Everything was clean, precise and orderly, and its chief characteristic seemed to be its bareness. The lines of the long, cold aisles and nave were broken only by some delicate wooden screens, sombre and dark in tone. The clear white of the walls was covered here and there by black and white eighteenth-century memorial tablets, side by side with one or two plain modern memorials of those sons of the place who had made the Great Sacrifice in the war. The only conspicuous colour in the place was the covering of the very bright blue "kneelers" and the indefinite green of the altar frontal.

The usual technical comments as to architecture had been made by the individual "appointed for the day"; we had heard of Norman, Early English, Transition, Decorated; we were engaged, as we went out, in pouring the usual flood of second-hand knowledge over our helpless friends—helpless because two cannot talk at once, and it is not polite to walk away from a speaker however much you may wish it,

and I was drifting with the rest with hopeful thoughts of the village inn and tea when the Seer touched my arm. His name in the City bank where he works is not nearly so appropriate.

"Did you see the brass?" he said. I nodded and was walking on, following the rest, but he made his touch more compelling. "Come back," he said. And I followed him to the chancel. There, on the north side of the altar, lies the small brass of a priest. I had seen only that it was polished brightly and that part of the inscription was torn away.

"He died in 1506," said the Seer. "His name was Stephen Holland. He was priest of this parish—he loved it, and every man, woman and child in it. He used to pray for them all here, day in and day out. He was young and he was anxious. The shadow of difficult days was gathering over the Church, and though it was still far away he saw it, and he was afraid. That beautiful cope in which he is drawn was not buried with him. It remained here for another half century. Then it was cut up to make a farmer's wife a gay apron and bodice. But she said it brought her ill-luck, and soon afterwards she brought it to be burned in the great bonfire in which they burned the Rood. Just outside there, on the green it was; the whole village was near the church then—it was rebuilt, after a fire in 1760 or so, half a mile away to be nearer to the main road. People had left off caring whether they were or were not near the church by that time. And do you see that a bit of the brass is gone? It bore the words, 'on his soul may God have mercy'; it was superstitious nonsense to make such a prayer. So that was wrenched away and thrown into the village blacksmith's basket of metal scraps. They did not take the brass itself—the memory of Stephen Holland as a holy man was yet in old men's minds and their sons did not dare to desecrate his tomb altogether. Come and see another thing." (I was gazing blankly at the Seer and I followed him without a word. He led the way into the end of the north aisle, which was partitioned off by high wooden screens.) "Come and see the figure of Our Lady here—this was the Lady Chapel: on that"—a large carved bracket at which I and the other members of the little crowd had stared vaguely a few minutes before—"on that she stood—a very beautiful figure—it made a great light in the place: all the candles that were burnt here, I mean. Her wide mantle was blue, of course, and the Child in her arms had a

sweet face, and there were always flowers on the ground below—lilac, wallflowers, clove pinks, roses—so sweet they could be smelt through the incense. They put her and the Child on the great bonfire, also—and as they broke down the support that held her and carried her out, men stood and watched on those belfry stairs—see, that same old wooden stair that leads to the ringing floor was there then—and some old men shuddered, and some women wept. But the bonfire roared and crackled outside. It was a quiet, very still day, and one heard the crackling through the door. The same day they moved the altar stone. It was hard work. It was on stone supports and heavily cemented down to them. But they got it off the supports—laid it just there, in the middle of the nave—and broke it with tremendous blows from a hammer. They couldn't manage it at first and sent a boy running for the most powerful man of the village—a mason. He refused, at first, to touch it. He was made to do it and to help place the three pieces into which it broke face downwards, in the church porch outside, that they might be daily trodden on. He declared that night that he would not tread on it. He never did; he died the next week, of a stroke.

"All this time a man—he was an expert in those things—was chipping to pieces the stained glass then in St. Nicholas' chantry. Its window had a picture of St. Nicholas and another of the Crucifixion, and words at the foot that asked for the prayers of the saints. So it had to go, of course. The screens: they were not burnt—a touch of grim practical economy moved some minds on that day and they were saved, because such good wood was useful to prop up falling cowsheds and pig-styes. And that work they did—for three hundred years and more. They have come back to their place. Will the gracious, gentle figure come back with her wide blue mantle—and will she again hold out the Child with his loving face and His outstretched arms—He Who made this corner—this church so—so welcoming, then? Will He come back—will He come soon, do you think?"

The Seer broke off abruptly, "I—it's late—come and find the others," he said.

"How in the world did you think of all that?" I said feebly, as we trudged down the village street. I was confused and bewildered.

"Think of it! I saw it—and I heard it—directly we went into the church," was his answer.

M. A. MOULE.

## SCHOOL PUNISHMENTS IN "MERRIE ENGLAND"<sup>1</sup>

**I**N the sixteenth century a graduate about to take his degree as a Master in Grammar was handed a stick and a birch-rod. To indicate quite clearly what should be the principal function of his schoolmaster's office, the new Master in Grammar was made to beat a boy publicly in the University Schools. The hapless youth chosen for this first experiment was compensated for his pains with a small piece of money, while the Beadle who prepared the victim for the traditional punishment was similarly rewarded.

The instrument of corporal punishment, a birch-rod, was the emblem of the scholastic profession. In old prints or miniatures schoolmasters are nearly always represented with birch-rod or stick in hand. The seal of Uppingham School is one such example.

Let us now glance at the system of punishment formerly in vogue.

### *Kinds of Punishment.*

A Boy-Bishop, preaching in 1490, has described the daily round at the old School of St. Paul's as follows:—No fault remained unpunished; sometimes the master pulled the boys' ears, sometimes he hit his pupils' hands with a stick, sometimes, armed with a birch-rod, he lashed them unmercifully, and so the unwilling seeker after knowledge was driven on either by threats or blows.

A rule in force at Winchester College in 1788 forbade the boys to go out of college without permission under pain of the following penalties. For the first offence the culprit was birched; if he transgressed a second time and was a preposter he was deprived of his office; if he was not a preposter he was sent down to the bottom of his class; if he broke bounds a third time his name was inscribed in the Black Book; if he persevered to a fourth attempt he was expelled.

Charles Lamb, who was educated at Christ's Hospital (the Blue Coat School), tells us that in his time the Blue Coat boy who was found guilty of such an offence was on his first

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from a thesis in French presented for a doctorate by the author of this article, and entitled, *Les coutumes scolaires dans l'ancienne Angleterre*. Printed by Ch. Hérissay, Evreux, 1920.

conviction put in irons, on his second shut up in a narrow cell, where he lay on straw and received no food other than bread and water. On a third offence he was conducted before the whole school dressed in a costume which made him look like a London lamp-lighter of those days, and in this apparel he was hoisted on the back of a beadle and was birched round the hall in the presence of the Governors. Lamb confesses that he had the courage to glance at one such victim as he was borne by, but the sight of the "ultima supplicia" revolted him.

*Instruments of Punishment.*

The great Samuel Johnson replied to someone who asked him how he became so good a latinist, "My master whipt me very well; without that, Sir, I should have done nothing." And on another occasion, changing several words in a famous line of Shakespeare's, he cried, "Rod, I will honour thee for this thy duty!"

Johnson's Grammar Master at Lichfield was a certain Hunter, whose severity was proverbial. The English school-master, saturated with biblical tradition, took as his daily text, "He that spareth his rod, hateth his son." Not content with the instrument sanctioned by Scriptural authority, he made use of several other instruments of castigation.

According to the "*Colloquium*" of Aelfric, a writer of the tenth century, the master took his stick in hand at break of day to arouse the youthful sleepers. The rule of a monastic school of the thirteenth century mentions that boys detected playing dice were promptly birched "*super nudum*." It is related that the frequency of this form of punishment necessitated clothing adaptable to its rapid execution. But it was above all with a stick that the master ceaselessly intimidated the troublesome and idle pupils.

Another instrument called a "*palmer*," used for giving blows on the hand, consisted of a handle ending in a round and flat surface. A miniature of the fourteenth century represents a master raising the "*palmer*" to hit a number of hands extended towards him.

We also find mention of a leather thong, or "tawse," as it is known in Scotland, but the favourite instrument was the birch, the very sight of which made the culprit's flesh tingle.

The byrchyn twiggis be so sharpe,  
Hit makith me haue a faynt harte.



In *The Desobedient Child*, written by Ingleland in 1560, a boy speaking of his companions says—

Their tender bodies both night and day  
Are whipped and scourged and beat like a stone,  
That from top to toe the skin is away.

It is reported of one schoolmaster that when he was cold it was his custom to beat his pupils "for no other purpose than to get himself a heat"; no doubt the boys were equally warmed.

### *The Execution.*

Faults were punished as soon as committed, as will be seen from the following translation of part of the rules for an unknown monastic school of the thirteenth century.

After washing their hands boys are to go to the Church, they are not to run, to jump or to giggle, nor cause any annoyance to man or beast. They are not to carry bows, sticks, or stones, in their hands, nor anything which could do harm; but they are to proceed quietly and soberly and with unhurried steps.

On entering the Church they are to sign themselves with the sign of the Cross, and to say the Our Father and Hail Mary, and to genuflect towards the crucifix, then rising they are to enter the choir, two by two, reverently and with becoming devotion; on reaching the middle of the choir they are to bow themselves humbly towards the altar, after which each one is to go to his stall or seat. The boy who disobeys this order will not escape swift punishment.

Standing or sitting in the choir they shall not have their eyes bent towards the laity but slightly towards the altar. They must not laugh, giggle or chatter, nor laugh at anyone if he sings or intones out of tune. Neither must they fight among themselves nor reply rudely when their elders question them. Those transgressing will be soundly beaten without delay.

According as the boys see their elders standing or sitting, they too shall stand or sit. In all things and in all ways imitating the correct customs and actions of the grown-ups. Those about to read before going to the lectern shall turn to the middle of the choir and reverently bow towards the altar, they shall do the same on returning to their places. They shall make the said reverence whether in their stalls or before the steps of the sanctuary when they are going to sing. Anyone who does not do so will immediately be soundly beaten.

No one shall cross the choir from one side to the other without devoutly bowing his head towards the altar, nor shall he cross at all except for a particular purpose. Those serving at the

altar shall act in the same manner as they come or go to their places, otherwise they will be soundly beaten.

One notices that each point of the rule is accompanied by a clearly defined injunction. Any transgressor was to be soundly beaten and that without delay.

The little clerk in the *Prioresses Tale* in Chaucer complained of having been beaten as much as three times in an hour.

More serious faults were punished at weekly meetings, much like monastic chapters. These were held every Friday at Winchester, Eton, and Westminster. Witness the following doggerel translation from a Latin poem describing the customs at Winchester:

Misery! Misery! Sorrow! Sorrow!  
 Bloody Friday comes to-morrow!  
 Bloody Friday, yes and truly!  
 For if I have been unruly  
 Any time this seven days  
 I shall suffer for my ways.

In the *Ludus Literarius*, or the Grammar School, by Brinsley (1628), we find some useful advice to pedagogues on the birch as a means of punishment. The master should take three or four of his scholars whom he knows to be reliable and sufficiently strong. If necessary he can take more. Let them hold the culprit firmly over a bench in such a way that he cannot move his hands or feet, or in default of anything else let them tie him to a post. That's the way to do it! For then he can neither hurt himself nor anyone else.

In every school beadles or monitors were appointed to lend their aid to a master who had to administer corporal punishment. The folklorist, R. Chambers, in *The Book of Days*, gives the picture of a "Flogging Horse," a block on three feet which long served as the sacrificial altar at the Free School at Lichfield.

That the birch or the rod was usually applied with vigour is universally witnessed, notably by the declarations of the Boy-Bishop of St. Paul's at the end of the fifteenth century, who, commenting in his way the text of the Prophet Jeremiah, "I see a waking rod," cries in his burlesque sermon: "Truely thys waken rodde often tymes hath troubled me in my childhede, that my loins are filled with burning."

In 1563 a schoolmaster named Penred was put in the pillory in Cheapside for having struck the son of a gentle-

man, his pupil, with a leathern strap with such violence that the skin of his unfortunate victim was broken. The boy, stripped of his shirt, was exposed hard by the pillory when the Lord Mayor passed, and it was, says the historian Stowe, "the most sorry sight you could see."

*Traditions and Opinions on Punishments.*

A curious tradition used to exist in England. Holy Innocents' Day was considered as a day of penance or of ill-omen, when parents used to beat their children in their beds early in the morning. This was their way of commemorating the Massacre of the Innocents. Still more curious is the custom reported by Aedmer in his *Miracles of St. Dunstan* by which the pupils of a monastic school were condemned to be beaten mercilessly six days before the Feast of Christmas, without any reason other than that it was usual.

Very often the habit of wielding the rod made masters distribute blows without rhyme or reason on innocent and guilty alike. Thomas Tusser mentions in the following lines the extraordinary liking which Udall, Headmaster of Eton, had for flogging and of which he was one of the numerous victims about the year 1540.

From Pauls I went to Eton sent  
To learn straightways the latin phrase,  
When fifty-three stripes given to me  
At once I had.  
For fault but small or none at all.

From time to time voices were raised in protest against the abuse of corporal punishment. In the eleventh century, St. Anselm advises appealing to the child's heart rather than terrorizing him with blows. In the same way, Ascham, in the first book of his *Scholemaster*, published in 1570, strongly reprobates the excessive severity of schoolmasters of his time. He recommends moderation, gentleness, true and unceasing sympathy on the part of the master to gain the affectionate confidence of the children. Erasmus similarly condemns the barbarity of schoolmasters in a book published in 1529. But all these protests were of little avail.

In 1638, Busby became Headmaster of Westminster and ruled there for more than half a century. He was the most feared man of his time.

And the victims, what did they think of those who tormented their childhood and adolescence with such devilish

ingenuity? We have already heard some complaints. There are times when the rancour shows itself violently. The Boy-Bishop of St. Paul's could wish nothing better for his master than Nero wished for Seneca, namely that he should kill himself.

If the poem entitled "The Birched Schoolboy" is really the work of a child, its author was not lacking in caustic or even brutal wit. After having recounted the miseries which his master had brought on him, he finishes with these lines, which call to mind the genius of François Villon: "I wish my master were a hare and all my books were hounds to hunt him! And I, well I would blow my horn,"

For to blow my horn I would not spare!  
For if he were dede I should not care.

But it is probable that most of the scholars bore their burden in patience and exercised resignation. At Charterhouse, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, an event happened which deserves notice. The Headmaster, Dr. Russell, wished to abolish corporal punishment and to replace this penalty by a system of fines. But the consequent detriment to the boys' exchequer made the system very unpopular. The boys protested and declared that they would rather be beaten than penniless. History does not record whether this determined resistance was due to a preponderance of Scotch pupils.

Physical suffering is soon forgotten; the victims, as they became older, retained little of their hatred for the torturers of their early years. For some of them, Samuel Johnson, for instance, the remembrance of the cruel discipline of the master increased his prestige as years went by. Busby has been considered by a great number of his contemporaries and by posterity, despite his extreme severity, as one of the master-builders of England's greatness in the seventeenth century. With flogging horse for anvil, this scholastic Vulcan, wielding his birch instead of a hammer, forged and fashioned many sturdy generations. He is buried among our national heroes in Westminster Abbey. Sir Robert de Coverley passing before his tomb is reported to have said: "There lies a great man, he beat my grandfather." A fleeting remark which shows only too well the general opinion of Englishmen in this matter up to the time of the Victorian Era.

G. C. BATEMAN.

## SCRUPLES : A MODERN POINT OF VIEW

**T**O judge from review articles, and books published from day to day, the public interest in pathological and abnormal mind-states shows no sign of diminishing, and two recent works,<sup>1</sup> concerned largely with the subject of "Scruples," perhaps justify a discussion of its interpretation from the modern point of view.

The subject of nerve-disease and mind-trouble, though full of interest, is nevertheless somewhat difficult and obscure for lay-folk. This obscurity will perhaps be somewhat diminished if a rough classification be borne in mind. Let us take three types of disease—"imbecility," "nervous exhaustion" and "obsession." The first type, "imbecility," is due to disease or lesion of the actual nerve-tissue. The trouble is, therefore, *anatomical*. The second type, "nervous exhaustion," is due to an unhealthy state of the nerve-tissue. The trouble is therefore functional and *physiological*. The third type, "obsession," is due to disorder in the activity of the mind-processes. In this case, the trouble is primarily *psychical*—though there probably is some functional nerve-trouble as well. Obsession, then, like hysteria, is regarded as a psycho-neurosis; a mind-disease proper.

Now it is to this last class that Scruples, if indeed it is a "natural" mind disease, belongs, for in every way it closely resembles Obsession. Commonly among Catholics it is looked upon as belonging to the "moral" as distinguished from the "natural" order, and there remains attached to it, something of the nature of a moral stigma. People are, of course, full of sympathy for the sufferings of those who are scrupulous, but they rarely think of sending them for treatment to neurologists. Many Catholics would be surprised, and perhaps shocked, at the idea of a lay-neurologist treating a case of scruples! Such cases, they think, belong *solely* to the spiritual director. And yet, as we shall see, there seems to be very good ground for regarding scruples

<sup>1</sup> *Le Gouvernement de Soi-même. L'Obsession et Le Scrupule.* By Antonin Eymieu, S.J. (Perrin : Paris, 1922).

*Direction de Conscience. Psycho-thérapie des Troubles Nerveux.* By Abbé D'Agnel et Dr. d'Espiney. (Téqui : Paris, 1922.)

much in the same light as hysteria or neurasthenia. This paper, then, may be regarded in the light of a plea for a frank recognition of the fact that "Scruples" is *per se* a nerve-trouble, a natural disease, calling for treatment along the lines of modern psycho-therapy. In order to understand how the neurologists of to-day, Catholic and non-Catholic, look upon "Scruples," it is necessary, first of all, to say a few words about what is perhaps the most common form of nerve-disease, namely *Obsession*.

Obsession usually appears under the form of an irrepressible idea, or an irrepressible phobia, or an irrepressible impulse—or it may be of a mixed type. The "idea" may be in the form of a question or a suspicion or an anticipation of a calamity. The "phobia" may concern animals, or places or situations or persons. The "impulse" may be to count, or to touch things or to say things. There is indeed no limit to the varieties of obsessions. Some people are obsessed with the "idea" that they are going mad, or that they are very ill, or about to lose all they possess. Or the thought grips their minds "that there is no God" or that "they do not love their children." Some are obsessed with a fear of cats, or of high or narrow places, or of some colour, or of catching infection. Some are obsessed with an impulse to pick up and read bits of paper, or to touch lamp-posts with their walking-sticks or to set things on fire or to wash and rewash their hands. Whatever the obsession is, it causes distress until it is obeyed, or yielded to. Then there follows a period of rest or satisfaction. Then the urge is felt again. And always, whether the obsession concerns a big or a little matter, there is in the sufferer's mind an immense importance attached to it.

The obsessed person struggles in vain to rid himself of the obsession, but it pursues and dominates him. He cannot escape from it by flight or master it by a frontal attack. Early and late, well or ill, but especially when ill, tired or depressed, the obsession exercises its tyranny upon him. The obsessions are, as Tuke writes, "morbid suggestions and ideas, imperiously demanding notice, the patient being painfully conscious of their domination over his wish and will." The obsession may be of short duration. It may be trivial too, such, for instance, as a catchy tune that clings and rings in our ears for hours together. Or it may grip us with terrible tenacity and utterly upset our peace of mind, intruding itself



into every line of thought, and playing havoc with our mental life for the time being, as when some bitterly sarcastic remark cuts us to the quick and sticks in our mind all day. "Every cerebral manifestation," writes Legrain, "either of the intellect or the affections, which in spite of the efforts of the will, forces itself upon the mind, thus interrupting for a time or in an intermittent manner the regular course of association of ideas, is an obsession."

Most of us have, at one time or another, suffered from an obsessing thought—the sickening gnawing of anxiety, the haunting torture of a recent insult or disgrace, the restless mental tossing of a hesitation, or the pangs of love—and so we are in a position to reconstruct without difficulty the psychology of an obsessed person. The obsessed person is mentally a frightened or disconsolate fugitive. And yet he is very interested in his pursuing enemy. He is so preoccupied (I talk of the more serious cases) that he gets quite out of touch with his surroundings, persons and things. He grows more and more introspective, intro-verted and self-centred. He loses hope and courage, and begins to be fatalistic. His constant failures, in attempts to get rid of his obsession, discourage him. He is usually willing to discuss his trouble, but advice and persuasion fail to dispel his fear or hallucination. At most there results a temporary relief. He is difficult to help. He appears to be anxious to be cured, and *consciously* he tries to make efforts, though only in a half-hearted way. He seems, somehow, to be resisting attempts to relieve him and to give him peace of mind. He is far from being mad in the true sense, for he is fully conscious of his state—it is a *folie lucide*. The demented do not usually realize that their "ideas" are false and foolish, but the obsessed do realize this, and they suffer all the more from the shame and humiliation of their state. The obsessed live a double life—their personality is in a way "dissociated"—into a true self and a false self. But they are unable to make the true self prevail. The false self constantly gets the upper hand. The true self is not swept away, as in hysteria, by a sudden emotional belief in the truth and reality of a delusion. In obsession there is always a struggle, wearisome and exhausting, against the false self, but it is a vain struggle. The will fails to function as it should. The obsession defies efforts to inhibit it. Soon the general health suffers, and depression increases.

It is not necessary here to dwell upon the theory which a careful study of obsession leads one to regard as suggestive and even probable, that there is some kind of *sub-conscious* "motive" working behind the obsession, and opposing all efforts to banish it. It is certainly astonishing how these patients, while consciously and avowedly asserting their desire to be cured, resist in the most subtle and determined way every effort made on their behalf, and how they seem bent on discouraging those who strive to help them. As Dr. Stoddart says, they "cling" pertinaciously to their malady, and (unconsciously) foster it. Their dreams, too, often reveal a point of view with regard to their obsession, that is diametrically opposed to that of their waking life.

Many theories of obsession have been put forward, notably those of Pierre Janet, Freud and Vittoz. They are all helpful in a way, though no one of them seems completely satisfactory.

To understand these theories, which we shall only very cursorily allude to, it is necessary to distinguish clearly between the "*content*" of the obsession, and the *obsession as a psychical entity* or process. The "*content*" may be the idea, "I'm going mad," "X is going to kill me," "Perhaps there is no God," "A cat brings me misfortune." The "*psychical entity*" of the obsession is its vital framework or mechanism, together with its affective and emotional intensity; in fine, its value as a mental actuality. The "*content*," then, is the conceptual or ideational element of the obsession, as distinguished from its psychical force.

Now the "*content*" of an obsession is more or less a matter of indifference. A most trivial and absurd idea can be the "*content*" of a very terrible obsession. Dr. Stoddart records a case in which the "*idea*" or "*content*" was that somebody might be drowning in an ink-pot! And we shall see how a silly and ridiculous "*idea*" may be the "*content*" of very severe "*scruples*." What is important in an obsession is, therefore, not the contained idea or fear or impulse, but the psychical force of the obsession and the depth of its roots, in so far as it is a habitual process.

Now, as regards the theories of obsession, Pierre Janet (and with him Père Antonin Eymieu, S.J.) attributes obsession to a lowering of the tension of vital psychical force. If the psychical energy available for mind work is over-taxed, wasted, and finally exhausted, tension of psychical

force sinks, and mental processes are no longer energized in a normal way. Voluntary inhibition fails, and obsessions become irresistible. For Freud, the great emotional power behind an obsession is due to what he calls "transference of affect." Some important thought, rich in emotional energy, lying in the sub-conscious, gets connected with some unimportant thought in the conscious mind, and transfers to it all its emotional force. The emotional background of one thought becomes that of another thought; the sub-conscious makes thus an irruption into the conscious life. Vittoz (and with him L'Abbé D'Agnel) also regards the obsession as the result of an invasion of the sub-conscious into consciousness, although his point of view is different from that of Freud. The invasion occurs owing to the loss of "cerebral control." Like Janet, he sees, in the obsessed person, imperfection in the mental processes of attention, concentration and volition. This imperfection results in a loss of touch with reality and a loss of self-mastery. Vittoz's theory may be looked upon as a compromise between the theories of Janet and Freud.

Having thus far explained what is meant by Obsession, and having referred to its symptoms as a psycho-neurosis, a mental disease of a purely natural kind, it is time to consider how far "scruples" can be looked upon as a type of obsession. And, first of all, it may be well to go over old ground briefly and see what "scruples" are.

St. Ignatius, in his "rules," deals rather with a *scruple*, than with the *state* resulting from constant recurrence of scruples, but nevertheless his rules help to elucidate the matter in question. In his first rule he shows that a scruple is not mere "error of judgment." An error of judgment can be easily corrected, but as we know, "scruples" are not so easily cured. Errors of judgment are not *per se* accompanied by the anxiety and trouble of mind that accompany scruples. Secondly, a scruple is not a "delicacy of conscience," as St. Ignatius shows in his fourth rule. Delicacy of conscience can and should exist in the soul of every good Christian, and it is quite compatible with perfect calm and peace of mind. A scruple, however, when there is interference of a certain kind, may spring up in a delicate conscience. Again, scruples are not to be identified with a great and constant fear of offending God by sin. Such a fear should normally be in the heart of every good Christian,

and it, too, is quite compatible with calm and peace of soul. It is something quite different from the nervous fretful perturbation of the scrupulous person. It may be added that "scruples" are not the same thing as uneasiness of conscience and remorse resulting from carelessly made and perhaps dishonest confessions. Such remorse can be cured by a well-made general confession. "Scruples" cannot be disposed of in this way. Furthermore, "scruples," which is a *jolie lucide* (the scrupulous person knowing clearly his state) are not to be confounded with that form of religious *dementia*, in which the patient believes himself abandoned by God. The whole mentality of the scrupulous person distinguishes him clearly from the demented.

Having seen what "scruples" are not, let us now see what they are. St. Ignatius explains the scruple in this way. A man treads upon a cross made of straws on the ground. He does so unwittingly. He notices what he has done and thinks he has committed a sin. This is not a scruple but an error of judgment. Later on, he begins to think, and from without (*extrinsecus*) a suspicion that he has committed a sin comes into his mind. (Perhaps he begins to fancy that he stepped upon the cross deliberately; but he is not sure.) There comes up then the thought that he has not sinned at all. A certain state of doubt, "ambiguity," and perturbation of mind stirred up by the devil, results. This now is a scruple according to St. Ignatius. Hence "perturbation of mind consequent upon a doubt, concerning the matter of sin," is the essence of the scruple. In the fourth rule, St. Ignatius points out how in a delicate conscience this perturbation can become so intense as to make one "miserably upset in mind," as when normal delicacy of conscience is pushed to extremes. This is injurious for spiritual progress. Hence we gather that St. Ignatius saw in an over-straining of mental analysis and attention, in an effort to discriminate too finely in the matter of sin, the cause of scruples.

Here then we are up against the *natural cause of scruples—over-strain with resulting exhaustion of mental processes*. And we have here, too, the *natural result*—perturbation and anxiety of mind. But all this takes place in connection with the moral conscience; and the "content" of the scruple, regarding it for the moment in the light of an obsession, is sin in some form or other.

What now does St. Ignatius suggest by way of cure? The

fifth rule merely tells us to oppose the tendency to overdelicacy of conscience, or to laxity, which the enemy has aroused in us for our destruction—and so he bids us, avoid extremes. We are "to keep the soul itself in a certain quiet and secure middle state," so that it may become altogether calm. Hence "strain" is to be avoided, and if the words "altogether peaceful" suggest a certain sensible or affective calmness, we have an implied recommendation to cultivate "psychical" tranquillity. It is clear that, in this advice, we have in outline a natural psycho-therapy. Strain in mental analysis is to be avoided, and mental calm secured—this is a psychical line of treatment to banish the "perturbation" of scruples. It is advice given with a supernatural object and from out a religious atmosphere. But, like similar advice given by St. Alphonsus, St. Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, and other great ascetical writers, it implies a recognition of the use of natural means in combating the evil. And it is interesting to notice how Père Eymieu, S.J., whose standpoint is purely and strictly scientific, comes to give the same advice as St. Ignatius. Having shown how scruples, as a type of obsession, result from wastage of psychical energy, he indicates how the wastage through overstrain and dissipation of force must be stopped by avoiding precisely this kind of tension. When the wastage is stopped, and the tension of psychical energy reaches again its normal level, the scruples can be overcome and driven from the mind.

It is not our purpose here to treat of the supernatural causes of scruples. St. Ignatius, when he alludes to the interference of the devil with a delicate conscience, is speaking of the supernatural element in scruples. We are keeping strictly to the natural element. As Père Eymieu points out,<sup>1</sup> "supernatural causes are at work, especially in the lives of saints, but here we are concerned with *natural* causes which play their part too. The supernatural respects the natural; even when it controls the natural it allows it to play its part, and it is to nature that we must attribute natural effects, until the contrary be proved." When, therefore, the

<sup>1</sup> *Le Gouvernement de Soi-même. L'Obsession et Le Scrupule.* By Antonin Eymieu, S.J. (Perrin: Paris, 27th ed., 1922), pp. 122 and 123. In a footnote Père Eymieu adds, p. 123: "Nous devons nous maintenir, ici, dans la psychologie expérimentale, avec un égal souci de ne rien affirmer au delà de nos preuves, et de ne rien nier de ce qui déborde notre sujet. Prescindre n'est pas nier. Signaler les causes immédiates et constitutives d'un phénomène, ce n'est pas en épuiser la genèse ni déclarer impossibles d'autres interventions."

natural causes and the natural explanation of scruples, as a mental disease, are put forward, it must not be supposed that there is no room for supernatural intervention as well.

The fact that the "content," or ideational element in the scruple concerns the supernatural, does not at all militate against the view. For, as has been implied, the "content" is not the important element in the scruple, indeed it matters little what the content is, whether it concern God or Mammon; the important element of the scruple is its psychical entity, its vital force, its value as a mental habit. Dealing with the scruples from which St. Ignatius suffered at Manresa, Père Eymieu first of all points out that, as far as can be known, St. Ignatius was not predisposed to scruples either by personal temperament or through heredity. He was eminently sane, level-headed, and came from a healthy stock. He was by no means neurasthenic; still less was he a likely subject for obsessions or hallucinations, and yet he suffered in an extreme degree from scruples for a period.

Days and nights passed in this terrible torture. Struggling continually with himself, he sought to determine what was and what was not sin; whether he ought, yes or no, confess certain past faults. The more he strove to see clearly, the more he was overwhelmed with darkness.<sup>1</sup>

Added to this there were suicidal tendencies and promptings to despair. Now what was *the natural cause*, apart from the supernatural, of this mental breakdown? Père Eymieu attributes it to the fact that St. Ignatius overtaxed his mental energy.<sup>2</sup> He had proposed to himself the gigantic task of utterly reforming his whole life. He suddenly set himself, in the midst of his vigils, penances and mortifications, that is, at a time when his natural psychical force was already heavily taxed, to conform his whole conduct to the highest ideal. The strain was too great. Mental processes could no longer function normally. The "tension" of his psychical force fell below par and he could no longer control normally the functions of his mind. Scruples resulted. The case of St. Ignatius was not unique. St. Alphonsus, St. Aloysius, St. Bonaventure, St. Francis de Sales, St. Augustine, and others, had like painful experiences. And, to take lesser examples, the strain of noviceship life frequently results in novices becoming afflicted with

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bartoli's *Life of Saint Ignatius*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *L'Obsession et Le Scrupule*, p. 123.



Scruples. In all this, very clearly, nature plays its part—and even in the spiritual life the laws of nature cannot be utterly disregarded.

L'Abbé d'Agnel is no less frank than Père Eymieu in regarding scruples as a natural disease.<sup>1</sup> To sum up his views:

The scruple is not a malady of the physiological or moral order. It is as distinct from neurasthenia as from the moral states of doubt, discouragement, and religious ignorance. It is altogether independent of the moral value of the patient; it may be seen in a Saint Ignatius, or in a schoolgirl of imperfect virtue. The fear of offending God, which springs from the delicacy of conscience of a Saint, belongs to the moral order. But the analogous fear (the obsessing phobia) in a scrupulous person belongs uniquely to the psychical order, and it has to be studied from the psychical point of view. In the case of the Saint, religion and morality are at play; in the case of the scrupulous person there is question only of psychical functioning. The former case belongs to the spiritual director; the latter to the psycho-therapist. The rôle of the latter is limited to reducing to normality and regularity the disordered functioning of the psychical faculties. There is no question of vices or faults that are conscious and voluntary, but only of functional trouble.<sup>2</sup> If it is right to struggle against faults and vices by a wise and firm direction of conscience; it is right to struggle against true scruples by a series of appropriate exercises, of the like natural order, such as those acts of consciousness and concentration designed by Dr. Vittoz.

In fine, L'Abbé D'Agnel would send a scrupulous person for treatment to a nerve specialist, just as he would send the victim of a hallucination, or of neurasthenia. For him scruples is a form of obsession, and like obsession, it is a psycho-neurosis pure and simple.

We have spoken frequently of scruples as an obsession, and the reason is, that from a purely psychological point of view, the symptoms are identical. The psychology of the scrupulous person is in every respect the same as that of an obsessed person. The same *folie lucide*, the same tendency to dissociation, the same impotence *vis à vis* of his scruples, or obsessions, is found in one and the other. Depression;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Direction de Conscience. Psycho-thérapie des Troubles Nerveux*. By L'Abbé d'Agnel et Dr. d'Espiney (Téqui: Paris, 1922), pp. 389—391.

<sup>2</sup> Père Eymieu refuses to regard a true scruple in the light of a temptation. "La tentation n'existe pas quand le moi spontanément l'exècre." Père Raymond, O.P., also regards scruples as a natural disease.

incapacity to co-operate with remedial measures; resistance to remedial measures; lack of interest in external persons and affairs during times of crises; lack of "cerebral control"; helplessness, and anxiety; fretfulness; together with an utter incapacity to master and control the scruples (or the obsession); all these characteristics belong both to the obsessed and to the scrupulous person. In each case "self-cure" is almost impossible; direction is needed, as well as complete submission to and confidence in the director.

The great ascetic writers, St. Alphonsus and the others we have already mentioned, were keenly alive to the natural aspect of scruples, and their writings are replete with wise advice concerning purely natural treatment. They saw as clearly as St. Ignatius that scruples lead to such "an extreme state of anxiety, such a miserable perturbation of soul, that spiritual progress is hindered," and they were extraordinarily anxious to cure their penitents by every legitimate means. St. Alphonsus was so convinced of the mental abnormality and incapacity of scrupulous persons that he treated them as, to some extent, *exlex* as regards the integrity of confession.<sup>1</sup> Fénelon saw in them "une espèce de déraison." But would these great ascetics, if they were alive to-day, and if they were satisfied fully of the skill and integrity of a mental specialist, approve of the sending of scrupulous folk for treatment to such a specialist? The present writer thinks that they would approve of such a course, especially where there might be a difficulty in procuring a spiritual director skilled in such cases, and free as regards time to devote himself to the work. As a matter of fact, L'Abbé D'Agnel states that many priests and nuns have been to Dr. Vittoz at Lausanne for treatment, and have been cured of their scruples by him. It is of interest, too, in this connection, to recall the fact that it is quite legitimate with the usual safeguards to seek in suggestion and hypnotism for alleviation from vicious habits, intemperance, drugging, etc., even though in such cases the moral order is directly at stake. The fact, then, that "scruples" has to do with the moral order should not preclude one, *per se*, from having recourse for alleviation to natural means.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Direction de Conscience*, p. 374: "Saint Alphonse de Liguori les considère comme un si grand danger au point de vue surnaturel qu'il juge préférable pour le scrupuleux de manquer à l'intégrité de la confession plutôt qu'd'augmenter son mal par des aveux plus complets."

As regards the natural methods of curing "scruples," every good system of psycho-therapy for dealing with obsession, when skilfully applied, will effect improvement, if not complete cure, where cure is possible. The prognosis, at least in the case of the young, is good. Mental analysis, combined with suggestion, and perhaps even hypnotism, is the sanest and surest method, although difficult and often tedious. The method of Père Eymieu, founded on that of Janet, is also excellent. Treatment by merely external means, such as "the Weir-Mitchell Rest Cure," hydrotherapy, electro-therapy, have the advantage of toning up the system as a whole, although less likely to effect a complete and permanent cure than the purely psychical methods. The system of Dr. Vittoz of Lausanne, which Abbé D'Agnel recommends as the best, is very skilfully designed, and seems to have had extraordinary success. Perhaps a few words about this method will make a suitable conclusion to this paper, for it is a strictly psychical method, and especially applicable to obsessing scruples. Abbé D'Agnel thus summarizes this method:<sup>1</sup>

Chez le scrupuleux, comme chez tout obsédé, le conscient ne remplit qu' imparfaitement et sans suite sa mission de control vis à vis de l' inconscient d' autant plus envahisseur qu' il rencontre une moindre résistance. D' où une certaine tendance à la dissociation de la personnalité qui n' aboutit pourtant jamais au dédoublement si général chez les hystériques. Si l' on veut guérir un scrupuleux, il faut le remettre en état de contrôler normalement ses idées obsédantes qui dès lors cesseront de l' être. Tant qu' il n' en sera pas maître, sa guérison sera incomplète. C' est donc la rééducation du contrôle cérébral qui s' impose, et c' est elle que poursuit le docteur Vittoz dans son traitement des psychonévroses.

And again:<sup>2</sup>

pour combattre efficacement un mal psychique, il faut logiquement soigner le psychisme qui en est le siège. Eliminer d' un sujet le scrupule équivaut à régulariser le jeu de ses opérations mentales.

Dr. Vittoz does not make a frontal attack on the scruple itself. He is quite indifferent to the "content" or ideational

<sup>1</sup> *Direction de Conscience*, p. 377.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 378.

element of the scruple. He refuses, as St. Alphonsus recommended, to discuss or argue with the scrupulous person. He begins by imposing on him a command not to talk of the nature of his scruple. Dr. Vittoz then sets the patient to perform, day by day, simple and ingenious exercises in attention of the senses, calculated to get the patient into touch with sensible, concrete reality. There follow simple exercises of concentration, and volition of a like kind. The exercises are graded, and varied. The patient is trained to eliminate sensations, memories and ideas. The will is toned up, and the power to make efforts is developed. Meanwhile, a real desire of being cured, and a sincere co-operation on the part of the patient, is aroused. The whole method is indirect, and aims at the recovery of "cerebral control," and the regularizing of mental functioning. No doubt there is the element of suggestion present, but it is not over-emphasized. When the patient has been won back to a normal state of adjustment to external reality; when his personality is reassociated; and when his mental processes, especially his volitional process, are once more normal, the scruples have no longer any terror for him or any hold upon him. He is cured.

This is but a brief and imperfect summary of the Vittoz method of mental re-education. But it will suffice to show along what lines the treatment runs.

To conclude, let us appeal once more for a frank recognition of the fact that "scruples" is a mere nerve disease, though concerned with facts of the moral order. The central interest of the pious person is his state of soul. The obsession that grips his exhausted or weakened mind deals naturally with that chief interest of his life, religion, and hence the "content" of the obsession of a pious person concerns sin. Similarly, the central interest of the business man as such is profit and financial stability. When his mind is weakened or exhausted, and he becomes obsessed, the obsession deals with his chief interest too, and it turns on the idea of bankruptcy or failure or ill-health and incapacity to trade. And, therefore, both sufferers act prudently and within their rights when they seek natural remedies for natural diseases, even though in the case of scruples, wherein the interests of the soul are at stake, supernatural therapeutics, prayer, obedience, etc., must also be invoked.

E. BOYD BARRETT.

## A NEW DISCUSSION OF THE APOCALYPSE<sup>1</sup>

FATHER MARTINDALE'S brief and lucid monograph upon the Apocalypse of St. John will be to many Catholics, and others, a welcome publication. Among the varied contributions of his pen to contemporary religious literature we should rank nothing as quite on the same grade of loftiness and practical utility. The excellence of the small treatise (it is not strictly a commentary) is no doubt largely due to the fact hinted in the dedication, and almost stated in the introduction, that it is the outcome, not of a momentary, much less hurried, effort, but rather the fruit of long periods of concentrated study and of ardent and prayerful thought.

Thus in his Catholic, as in his pre-Catholic days, the writer has been fortunate enough to escape the common lot of those Christians who have persistently under-appreciated and misinterpreted this crowning glory of the Sacred Canon. Not but that Catholics have familiarity, more or less conscious, with many phrases and even passages taken from the Apocalypse. But they rarely, so far as we know, pay much attention to its pages, unless possibly to its somewhat extrinsic introduction, the Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia. Whereas, not to speak now of the more difficult and dire-sounding portions which have caused so much heart-searching to commentators and controversialists, there are considerable tracts of the book which are comparatively simple and at the same time extraordinarily beautiful and inspiring. Roughly speaking, any concrete ideas which the Faithful possess about the glories of Eternal Life are taken from this source, and, indeed, the descriptions not merely of Heaven, but of the Church on earth—of Christ Himself as the Word of God with countenance shining in his strength and a two-edged sword proceeding from His mouth—of the souls of the martyrs beneath the altar with their loud cry for vindication, and the promise given to every one of them with the present of a white robe of justification—and of the

<sup>1</sup> "Princes of His People." *St. John the Evangelist* (II.). By C. C. Martindale, S.J. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Price, 4s. net. 1922.

Great Woman in travail clothed in radiant sunlight with a coronal of stars and the moon beneath her feet—the word-painting of the Apocalypse seems to approach the limits of poetical possibility.

It has, therefore, always appeared to us something of a puzzle why there has been little attempt to popularize at least certain portions of the Apocalypse. The way it presented itself to our mind was that there are large sections which would in fact exercise a powerful spell over the mind of the ordinary reader, were they not associated too closely in his mind with quite different passages, which (partly owing to their own nature and partly to extrinsic associations) have so far proved the reverse of attractive,—to put it mildly. We were inclined to think that, if ecclesiastical authority approved—gaining which, might we not hope to escape the author's own terrible curse?—it might be worth while to disentangle the more intelligible from the undoubtedly strange and terrifying chapters. For instance, not to speak of the Prologue, chaps. i.—iii.; there are in the Apocalyptic portion, chaps. iv. and v., and we might almost add vi.; chaps. xv., xix., xx., and xxii.; that is numerically about one half the chapters of the book—which are almost entirely free from weird and (humanly speaking) repellant imagery. Some of the chapters referred to may indeed include incidentally phrases or short passages of a strongly symbolical nature; on the other hand, it might be possible to detach parts of other chapters which would be fairly plain-sailing for the multitude. We can hardly imagine that, could sufficient reason for such a mutilation be propounded, and could it be properly explained to the reader that the arrangement was made less as an ideal one than as a concession to his own weakness—and with the hope that it might tempt him to dig deeper into the inspired treasure-house of prophecy, any very serious objection could be made to such an undertaking. We are, of course, acquainted with the excision and separate publication of part of the Gospel, namely that relating to our Lord's Passion; and we also have the official collection of extracts from the Gospel, as framed for liturgical usage. The division of the Apocalypse which we envisage might, however, cause difficulty to those in authority; without actually advocating it, we merely suggest that there are portions of it which seem to us to rank almost with the Gospels, certainly with any other por-



tion of the New Testament, as suited for the general reader who now, as we believe, neglects the whole book.

Whatever may be thought of our suggestion we feel that the effect of reading Father Martindale's essay is to make us less urgent in proposing it. Emphatically he treats of the Great Revelation as an organic unity wonderfully compacted, and he would, we believe, hardly countenance any attempt to separate the easy from the difficult. But what is even more important than his insistence upon the solidarity of the Apocalypse is the flood of light which he pours upon its character as a united whole. He does this, not by textual interpretation of the parts, but by announcing that basic principles run through the writing. He emphasizes so strongly the principle of Inspiration in the highest sense that he turns away his reader's mind from fixing itself upon such details as chronology or specialized application of comprehensive truth. In like manner, without wearying us with critical argument, he expresses an almost impassioned conviction of the unity and truly Johannine authorship (in the orthodox sense) of the work. He even strengthens this view by allowing a strong probability that the Apocalypse consists, not so much of a single vision (as has been perhaps too easily assumed), but rather of a series which may vary in time and circumstance, but are organically inter-related. If this be so, we can at a single stroke emancipate ourselves from any tendency towards mechanical interpretation, or supposing that there must be a picture offered of successive historical happenings.

The keynote to Father Martindale's view seems to be that, while the seer's eye was fixed upon what was broadly contemporaneous, yet it was ever tending to transcend the actual, to view it mainly as symbolizing permanent principles, the struggle between good and evil, between God and the devil, between the doctrine and Church of Christ and all that is opposed to the same. Thus it is perfectly sound to state that the prophecy relates to the end of all things, for it truly belongs to the Beginning, the Middle and the End.

A quotation will make this plainer:

I see then that John relates, in succession, the contents of three levels of perspective, though the happenings on each several level are simultaneous. Here are the Christians being persecuted by an Emperor. That is an event proper to one age and one place—the Rome of Nero and Domitian. But John

sees further than this, just a little further to begin with. He sees a collectivity of Emperors—the persecuting Empire—the Beast. This deepens the perspective so slightly that we can still call it the first level, for it is still concerned with Imperial Rome as such. But then, John sees further still—much further. He sees that never in the world's history will there not be such a beast—smitten to death he revives and renews his attack. Only with the end of the world itself will that Beast come to his own end. But deeper still than universal history does John see. He looks right down into the roots of evil—spiritual evil—the Ultimate Adversary. That is Satan: John sees his overthrow no less than that of all his instruments, and that then God shall be "All in All."

The above extract appears to sum up Father Martindale's views about interpreting the Apocalypse, and we accordingly transcribe it, though with misgiving as to the justice of presenting it without its proper context. The reader must not suppose that the system when viewed on a larger scale is complicated, still less artificial. It is a misfortune that few if any readers will come to the book with unprejudiced minds, or shall we say minds previously wearied by interpretations which were complicated and artificial indeed.

The theory propounded as to the structure, or what the writer calls the articulation, of the book is illuminating. The mechanism outlined must be called artificial, yet when its un-failing repetition is noted, its very elaborateness makes for simplicity of a sort, while it certainly puts all literalness out of the question. There are constant groups of seven objects in the several visions, and these septads are divided alike into sub-groups of 4, 2 and 1. Before the seventh unit a double Intercalary Vision is normally intruded—thus giving the effect of a marked climax in the series of visionary events.

To trace this arrangement in detail, or to give specimens of it, would be interesting enough to those who are at all acquainted with the Apocalypse; but we refer such readers to Father Martindale's pages with all confidence that they will appreciate and admire his lucid treatment of the whole theme.

His views, while entirely original as to exposition, are not new, or there would be some difficulty about accepting them as we do upon the whole. He tells us of the debt he has incurred to the previous works of Dr. Swete and Father Allo, O.P. With regard to the latter's researches,

Father Martindale says they were published long after he had written his own treatise; but he has availed himself of them and discusses them freely. In particular, he agrees with the Dominican that the final draft, at least of the Apocalypse, must have been made during the Emperor Domitian's rabid persecution, and probably at the end, that is during the two last years, of his reign. This theory, among other advantages, seems to give the key to the phrase that whereas there were but seven beasts, "there is an eighth which was and is not, *and is of the seven*, and goeth into destruction." Domitian was called "Nero Redivivus," because he was thought to embody the dead Nero. The explanation of the celebrated 666 as the number of the Beast is also particularly satisfactory; but here we must again refer to our author. That the Beast is in some sense the Roman power is stated so clearly in chap. xvii., v. 9, that one wonders how so many commentators went astray in their search for eschatology.

Father Martindale perhaps rightly makes no reference to the Protestant commentators, but it is really interesting to note how deeply the English mind was obsessed by its anti-Papal theories, and, moreover, how seriously Catholic editors of a couple of generations ago laboured to prove that by the Scarlet Woman, the Beast, Antichrist, Babylon, and the Dragon, St. John did not refer to the modern Papacy. But absurd as all that must appear to students of our day, we may admit that forced and unnatural interpretations of St. John were by no means peculiar to the Reformation Divines.

One point of some importance may be here touched upon. We think that Father Martindale might have emphasized a little more what we believe he holds, namely, that the wonderful description of God's Tabernacle with which the Apocalypse concludes, while it may be referred also to the Church Triumphant, is mainly intended to apply to the Church upon earth, which is distinctly stated to have "come down from God out of Heaven." Of Heaven, too, it can hardly be said that "the nations shall walk in the light of it," or that "the kings of the earth bring into it their glory and honour." We believe that the earlier commentators understood of chap. xxi. that it was a picture of what St. Augustine called "*Civitas Dei*"; and it seems to us that this truth has been a good deal over-clouded among Catholics, probably owing to Protestant influence working uncon-

sciously. It is important to have a sublime view of the Eternal City of Jerusalem; but it is as well for us to realize that St. John's own method of impressing it upon us is to advert to what we see and know, and to teach us to raise our minds to Heaven by studying its earthly counterpart in which our lot is happily cast.

As an instance of the writer's literary art in giving the English reader an impression of the power and beauty of the original, we quote the following rendering of a familiar passage:

A high wall was round her (the city) to protect her, and at each of its twelve gates stood an angel-sentinel, and on the gates were the names of the twelve tribes of God's Israel, and the foundations were the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. The foundations were a rainbow glow of jewels—the soft green of the jasper, the deep blue-green of the lapis-lazuli; chalcedony, green, the ancients tell us, like the peacock's tail, or the shifting colours of a pigeon's throat; then emerald; then sardonyx, in which white mingles with transparent rose; in the sardian stone the rose deepens to crimson, and the chrysolite, the beryl, and the topaz, reintroduce the softest yellows and golden greens, till in the sapphire and the amethyst the glorious blue melts into violet. And the gates were pearls, and the city rose through green of jasper and refulgent yet translucent gold to its summit.

And there! The Source of its radiance; the Light no more inaccessible, but pervasive through the whole.

A Temple saw I not therein,  
For the Lord, God, the All-Governor, is her temple  
And the Lamb.  
Yea, the city hath no need of the sun nor of the moon,  
That they should give her light,  
For the glory of the Lord did give her light,  
And her lamp is the Lamb.

Father Martindale's treatment of the Vision of the woman who brought forth the man child and was given the wings of an eagle to fly to the desert, is wholly satisfactory. He combines the direct interpretation which the early Fathers gave of this vision with the more modern view which our well-known symbolism indicates.

We should have liked the addition of an Index to this valuable book.

HENRY BROWNE.

## FALLEN LEAVES

### V.

WHEN Medontiphron's son Medon was ten years old he fell sick, and was sent to spend the summer months with his aunt on the slope of Hymettos, for her house was cooler than the farm, which lay low. As he got better, she allowed him to do very much as he liked, for that a woman reverend with years should be expected to pursue all the day, not a child, but a puppy from the fields, not a human, but a summer lightning, here one moment but none knew where the next, was a thing not to be so much as mentioned, an infinite thing, a work for gods, not women. So Medon used to go wandering at will, and one day went out to Lukabettos, the pointed hill from which one could observe the whole Kephissian plain, and climbed half way up it on the seaward side. But he did not observe the plain for long, for he lay down and slept, and the scent of the thyme rose round him like incense for the gods, and the humming of the bees and the voices of the innumerable crickets were his sleep-song.

He was awakened by children's cries, and raising himself a little he saw a wagon having three children in it and their nurse. It was climbing the track up Lukabettos, and stayed on a flat place somewhat below him. They all got out, and the nurse gave them honey-cakes and apples to eat, and weak wine from a flask, and herself drank other wine from a skin, and forthwith slept. And the muleteer also drank wine and he too went to sleep.

But the children, with loud cries, played with a red ball, throwing it to one another, calling shrilly. Medon perceived that the eldest, who cried out least, was called Klu-Klu, and another was Pnellê, and the third, Lellê. Medon did not look long at Klu-Klu, for she was slow and laughed but little, and had thick eyebrows that met over her nose and he did not like this: nor yet at Lellê, for he thought her a foolish girl, awkward and letting the ball fall helplessly. In truth Lellê was just growing tall, and her legs were long and thin and her hands were a difficulty to her for using them; also she had yellow hair infinitely, that tossed about in her eyes

and would get entangled even in her necklace of amber that leapt round her neck as she ran. But Pnellê was a goddess, not a girl; never had he seen anything so radiant, and he loved to watch her. After a while this girl threw the ball so high that it fell into some heather where they could not see it, but Medon, from above, could see it.

"Clumsy Lellê," she cried. "Why did you not catch it?"

"I am tired," said Lellê.

"You can never catch. You are always tired."

"I was not born to be able to catch balls," said Lellê, and she stood with her mouth drooping and played with her necklace in confusion.

"What were you born for at all?" cried Pnellê. "The dear gods know, not I. Look! Hunt! You lost it and you ought to find it."

"I do not know where it has gone," said she.

"O doll! O wicker-head! If we knew where it has gone it were not lost."

Lellê sat down on a rock and none could have moved her.

But Medon got up from where he lay and went down to tell them where it was.

When Pnellê saw him, she uttered loud cries and ran to Klu-Klu and threw her arms round her neck.

"It's a boy," she said to Klu-Klu, and over her shoulder she looked back at Medon and he thought she was frightened.

"What of it?" said Klu-Klu, and she unwound Pnellê's arms from round about her neck. She looked at Medon but said nothing. Lellê neither looked nor spoke.

Medon found the ball and brought it to Pnellê, but Klu-Klu took it from his hand and Medon bowed politely, thinking her of noble race but not liking her. He then fixed his eyes on Pnellê, eyes of worship, as on a radiant goddess. Pnellê cast down her eyes duly and pulled the fringe of her dress over her nose and mouth, and then over it looked once more at Medon, and the ground swayed like the sea beneath him.

Then Pnellê whispered something to Klu-Klu. Then she turned back and smiled to Medon.

"You may play with us, little boy," she said, and Medon became a god for blessedness. "But," she said, "you must not make a noise, for Mammê would not suffer us to play with unknown boys."



"We will not play this game any more," said Klu-Klu.  
"We will play Cockchafer."

"I want to play too," said Lellê getting up.

"No, no, no," said Pnellê. "We don't want you. You always get tired, and you can never catch anybody. Go away."

Lellê ran up to Klu-Klu.

"Say I can play, Klu," said she, tears in her eyes.

"You would get tired," said Klu-Klu. "We can do without you. Do not cry. Go away and dry your eyes. It is foolish to cry. Go to sleep. I shall only get into trouble if you get too hot. Papa says he cannot think what you are made of. No wonder—you have egg-shells instead of bones."

When she said that, Lellê turned her back and went away.

"Wake up the muleteer," said Klu-Klu. "We must have one more for Cockchafer. Three are not enough. Kick him."

"I am shy," said Pnellê turning eyes like stars on Medon.

But Klu-Klu went and kicked the muleteer and made him get up to play with them. One of the players had to be blinded with a veil, and then he had to run after the others, calling out: "I will chase the big bronze fly," and the others answered: "You won't catch us though you try." When anyone was caught, a forfeit had to be paid. Klu-Klu was blindfolded first, but she did not try very hard; and then Pnellê was blindfolded, but it was certain that she could see round the corner of the veil, for she did not wish to fall or to run into bushes, for she would have felt foolish in her mind. Then the muleteer had his eyes covered, and could not catch anyone, and for long they mocked at his running to and fro and his falls.

Lellê climbed up the hillside to where Medon had come from, and she lay down in a hollow place, so that, propping her chin on her hands, she could look on sky alone and sea. Nothing else, from her hollow, was visible. And it was to her as if the sun was covered with cloud, and as if all things were gone grey, and then, as though no thing was anything.

"I am not wanted," she said to herself. "I cannot play. I cannot do anything. All I do is wrong. It is a fate upon me. I shall never be like anyone else."

A great lump rose in her throat and she felt that she

wanted to scream and could not, and she was frightened, and then for a space she cried.

"It is always the same," she said. "I shall never, never matter to anybody. Why was I born? O miserable egg." For her nurse had told her that she had been born from an egg. That was what Klu-Klu had meant when she mocked her, for Lellê had once been rather proud about the egg, and thought that her father was Zeus himself. But now she wished she had never been born. And suddenly she felt again that she was no one and nothing, and that nothing was real anywhere, and she spread all her fingers out and gave a wail. Then suddenly she felt tired, and she stopped crying, and she ate a honey cake, for she had brought one with her. After this she felt better and took her necklace and kissed it.

"I love you," she said.

She sat there playing with it till she heard a sharp cry and looked over the edge of the hollow.

Medon was holding one hand to his cheek, and looking angrily at Pnellê. Pnellê was standing, very pink and proud, with her hands on her hips. Klu-Klu was looking too at Pnellê, and her eyebrows were heavy and very black.

Lellê got up and went down towards them.

Medon had been chasing the other three, and the gods favoured him, for though blindfolded he had caught Pnellê. When he had taken the bandage off she stood, like a rose in a garden of gods, and he had asked a kiss for forfeit. Then she had struck him.

"Insolence!" she cried. "You would dare . . . ?"

"Why? Why?" he had gasped.

"I am the princess Penelopeia, daughter of Ikarios," she said. "You have the insolence to ask! Goatherd!"

"I thought you wanted me to," said he, being indeed but a country boy.

Medon saw the three princesses yet once more, when with his mother he had taken vegetables into Athenai for the market. There were some foreign princes in Athenai just then, from Ilios across the sea to the east, Hektor and his brother Paris, sons of the king of Ilios, called Priamos. All of them were riding in a great wagon in from the country, but Penelopeia had no eyes for anyone save Paris, nor he for anyone save her.

But from very far off indeed the Fates had been weaving the web wherein were once more to meet the threads of all these lives. Over how many hills, through what distant valleys, and across what rivers and what seas, had not the lives of men stolen forth, separated, paused, and started afresh, only, after these thrice a hundred circling years, to rejoin.

When the first Medon had moved southward, he left behind him, as has been related, his wife and his little son. Medon was caught by the god into a divine dwelling, and his elder son, who had come with him, had the history we have told. But when Medon never came back to the north, it was known by the northerners that the road he had travelled was unblest; and somewhat later, when a new band of that tribe left the starving mountains, according to that Fate whose servant hunger was, it took an eastward road and did not even turn south when it came to the parts above the vale of Tempeä, but pursued the path towards the sunrise. Having crossed the great river that their sons named Axios, they settled all along the coast and, mingling with the folks of those parts and with the traders from the east itself who had settled there too, they became solid tribes of Paionés, of Kikonés, and even poured their blood into the Thrakés. But the Thrakés had already found the limit of that land, and at their easternmost the sea came rushing. But it came only through a narrow strait, and beyond this another and a mountainous land rose shadowy. That was a terrible strait to cross, so fierce was the water that came rushing down it from the east and the north. And first, the immigrants did but make settlements upon the tongue of land that stretched out alongside of it on the northern side. But after a while they crossed it. Up the strait they went only a little way, to where it widened out into a sea, and this, from the name of the shore south of it, was called the Askan sea; but they saw that after a space it narrowed again, and then spread out into so huge, so grim and so violent a sea that they went no further. But later they carried the Askan name out into this greater sea, changing the name Askan somewhat into Axenos, because it was so inhospitable, and afterwards into Euxeinos, the Right Hospitable Sea, for fear lest they should have offended its gods. And indeed long afterwards they sailed to its very end, and the fleeces that Iason had brought back were thought to have come from those very distant parts, from near the river Phasis, a river haunted

by birds with polished wings like metal, a river where gold was washed down like powder, and, hanging fleeces across the stream, men caught the gold in the fleeces and made traffic with it. But many generations had come and gone before that happened.

Instead, then, of pursuing their course eastward through these straits, the Northerners at last managed to cross them, though by scores they were drowned in attempting it, so did the current hurl them to this side and that. And almost immediately opposite the tongue of land that made the northern rampart of the mouth of the straits, they found a little valley running southward, with hills to the east, and a line of hills also to the west, shutting it off from the open westward sea. Only a short way down it on the left was a fortress, very ancient, and as time went on the Northerners, having settled and increased around it, became its masters just as their kinsmen over the water did, in Mukenai, Athenai, Spartê, and the rest. And so all that district of Troiê, with its strong place, Ilios, became full of men who talked almost the same tongue as did the dwellers over the sea from Spartê up to Tempeä. And little by little they struck inland, though with great fear and hesitation, and found there a great people, which still further into the east had silver mines, and by trading with them Ilios became rich and its kings were able to control much of the traffic both up through the straits and south along the coast, just as the great silver-mining people over the eastern hills did while it had power. Yet there was one settlement, Miletos, to the south, in which the new-comers gained not a little strength. But what Ilios made much gain from, too, was the endeavour of their kinsfolk overseas to trade upwards through the straits into the Askan Sea. For, as I have told, the current through those straits was cruelly violent, and most of the little boats of traders could hardly beat up against it, and the freight was risked. So for many it became a habit to touch at the shore lower down than the south side of the straits, and to disembark the merchandise and to carry it in wagons by a track through the little valley whose mouth was inside the mouth of the strait. But this track, though it avoided the dangerous entry to that narrow water, led straight beneath the walls of Ilios, and the Troiês came rushing out and raided the wagons, and much merchandise was lost to the traders, and the fortress Ilios became a name

of hatred to them. So there were always little wars beneath the battlements of Ilios. Yet since this was not good for Ilios any more than for the traders of the Achaeans, Priamos, king of Ilios, a man of wealth and many sons, had sent his favourite sons Hektor and Paris over the seas to visit the Achaean kings, together with grave councillors who should strike a treaty and direct the trade with advantage to both sides. And some sort of a treaty indeed they made, though none observed it, and it was then that Medon saw those two princes and the three royal maidens, and it was thus that the threads of his life first became entangled with those of Ilios and the people there. Yet in truth the knot was earlier formed, for there were under the walls of Ilios men living who had descended from his first ancestor, the divine Medon, inasmuch as that Medon's wife, with his younger son, had migrated to those parts, as also has been said, and under Ilios they still worshipped Zeus Medon, and knew themselves his sons.

And the years went round, and Penelopeia was married to Odusseus, king of the Kephallenoi in the far west, having his home in the island Ithakê; and Helenê had become the wife of Menelaos, son of Atreus, who lived far south in Spartê, and was over-lord of many places in that district, Lakedaimôn; and as for Klutaimnestra, she had been given to Agamemnon, brother of Menelaos, and him the gods prospered, in their malice, beyond what the mind of mortals may support, and there were few cities, from the southernmost to Tempeä, of which he was not over-lord, and had them bound to him by every kind of oath.

But when the Fates had sufficiently tossed the shuttle to and fro across the sea, weaving men's live together, then on a sudden they wearied of the task and prepared the mind of Paris, son of Priamos, to tear the web to pieces. Yet never may man, be he fool or very skilful, make utter havoc of it; but the threads, flying apart over the seas and mountains, yet come once more together, and the web reforms itself, imperishable to the eyes of Zeus All-Seeing, though to men's sight both blood and tears have rotted the very fibres of its strands.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

## THE PLAGUE OF PSEUDO-SCIENCE

IT is sad to think that, whereas truth is difficult enough to grasp with our imperfect human faculties, even when the effort is sincere and the circumstances favourable, there prevail in our midst almost innumerable agencies for disseminating falsehood. I am not referring now to the daily or weekly press, for if a person believes anything on the sole authority of a party journal his zeal for truth cannot be called very strong. I refer to the perversion of history on which non-Catholic youth in this country is trained and of which this review has said much in the past,<sup>1</sup> and especially to the perversion of science, spread abroad by a multitude of atheistic text-books, still following the Darwinian tradition. Mr. Wells's *Outline of History* is an excellent type of the former, and Professor Thomson's *Outline of Science*, though a fairer book, must yet be classed amongst the latter. Accordingly part of our duty as Catholics is to bear witness to the truth, in one or other of these departments, to the best of our ability, or at least to bear witness against what is false.

"Slowly but surely the idea of evolution is undermining the foundations of orthodox Christian theology." These are the words with which an eminent freethinker, Mr. E. G. A. Holmes, to whose free (and incorrect) thought about Christianity we had occasion to call attention in this Review a dozen years ago,<sup>2</sup> opens an article in a recent *Hibbert Journal*. I do not propose to discuss that article, which shows indeed that Mr. Holmes has no more understanding of Christianity now than he had then, nor to point out in detail the puerility of his arguments against the fundamental laws of thought, no step of which discussion could he rationally take without implicitly calling on their aid. We merely wish to emphasize again that the supposed quarrel between religion and science, herein insisted on, can only be maintained by gross and persistent misrepresentation of

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, "The Lie in English History," *THE MONTH*, Jan. 1919: "To Reconstruct the Past," by Dom J. B. Ryan, O.S.B., Jan. 1920.

<sup>2</sup> See "The Ideas of a Chief Inspector of Schools," by the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J., *THE MONTH*, Nov. 1911.



what religion stands for and what are the achievements of science. The notion that Christian theology is afraid of the "idea of evolution" shows the obscurantism in which your modernist dwells. This particular assailant is of course unaware that St. Gregory of Nyssa in the East and St. Augustine of Hippo in the West, relying solely on the Biblical record, held an evolutionary theory in regard to the origin of species far more thorough than that of Darwin, whilst St. Thomas and the Scholastics found no difficulty even in the evolution of life from non-living matter. It was, in fact, the growth of the scientific spirit in the Church, the fuller investigation and clearer understanding of the laws of Nature, brought about in many cases by ecclesiastics, that gradually made her later theologians chary of such sweeping hypotheses. It is the free-thinker now who has become credulous, who allows his desires to damage his capacity for truth, who goes beyond what evidence warrants, who cultivates apriorism and prejudice. It is a strange nemesis on the rationalist abuse of human reason that its votaries should thus fall into superstition and sink to forgery and falsehood, whilst the Church, miscalled the foe of learning, remains almost the sole refuge of correct, self-consistent thought. And if there is one idea more than another familiar to that Church, it is the idea of evolution, for she alone teaches the existence of the Absolute, without which the contingent could not evolve. If we read his misty metaphysics aright, Mr. Holmes conceives the Absolute as itself a result or process of evolution, God, he suggests, instead of "being" may be "becoming," as if "becoming" were not itself in the category of "being," and as if there could be an intermediate stage between existence as such and non-existence. Having so disposed of the Law of Contradiction, he proceeds to reject revelation as well as reason, and imagines that the idea of God is a work of human minds, which are still engaged in elaborating and modifying their own creation. He does not know that, so far from Christian theology being embedded in "a static conception of the universe"—to use his curious phrase—it teaches that God is not only Absolute Being but pure Activity, that the Divine energy is so immense as to find necessary expression in the ineffable wonder of the Trinity, that the essence of creaturehood is mutability and change, that, though God is necessarily changeless, being infinitely perfect, man's thought about God is always growing in richness and variety. There is a good deal, in

fact, that Mr. Holmes does not know about Christian theology and Catholic doctrine, and his ignorance will not be dissipated by a casual search amongst theological textbooks.

But the notion which he expresses is, after all, prevalent enough, owing to the determinedly atheistic attitude adopted by modern scientific teaching. Apart from the writings of avowed materialists of the school of Hæckel, there is a lamentable fear and disuse, in the scientific writings of our day, of knowledge derived from revelation. The giants of science a generation or two ago were bolder or more honest; Lord Kelvin, Professor Stewart, Professor Tait, Sir W. Siemens, Sir J. Herschel, Faraday, Clerk-Maxwell, A. R. Wallace, etc.—these men had no hesitation in proclaiming in their scientific books the necessary existence of a First Cause. "No system of the Universe," said Sir J. W. Dawson, "can dispense with a First Cause, eternal and self-existent; and the First Cause must necessarily be the living God, whose will is the ultimate force and the origin of natural law."<sup>1</sup> By far the greater proportion of eminent scientific men in the past have believed in revelation and not a few have proclaimed their belief, but it is becoming increasingly rare to find modern scientific writers acknowledging that source of information. It is true that the sciences of observation are not concerned with ultimate causes, still less with religious philosophy, yet surely the knowledge wherewith God has supplemented the researches of reason should be employed or kept in mind, when hypotheses are framed to account for observed facts. The materialists have set an unfortunate fashion in this matter, and although their doctrine is all but abandoned, few have had the courage to shake off their literary methods.

The recently published *Outline of Science*, as we have suggested, which is an endeavour to make the "general reader" aware of the present state of knowledge in every department of scientific research, is a great offender in this way. It assumes that before Darwin and Spencer the idea of evolution was comparatively unknown, whereas the human mind necessarily investigates causes and in no branch of study has its historical development ever been neglected. The old lawyers went back to Roman law; the physicians, alchemists, astronomers, were all acquainted with what their predecessors had achieved; even theology had its positive

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Idea of Evolution* (1890), p. 241.

side, and the gradual unfolding of the deposit of revelation was recognized from the first. Evolution in its wider aspect simply means a process of growth, an idea always familiar to mankind. What the great physical scientists did was to apply that familiar notion to the organic world, and to endeavour to account for existing species by tracing their ancestry. "The Doctrine of Evolution," says the *Outline of Science*, with the air of announcing a discovery, "states the fact that the present is the child of the past and the parent of the future." Who in the world ever denied that truism? But it is another thing to assume *as an established fact* that the Author of Nature never intervened directly or indirectly in the history of His creation to introduce new forces, and to assist or modify development. The whole of the materialistic treatment of the subject is vitiated by the assumption that there is no Creator and no Designer, that the alleged development of the vast organic world from a few simple elements is the outcome of blind impulses and self-established laws. Hence the *Outline of Science* and other popular works are full of dishonesty, the dice are loaded against any hypothesis save the materialistic one, difficulties enormous and insurmountable are ignored or discounted, and the evidence, especially in support of the animal origin of man, is flagrantly and impudently "cooked." The hopeless inadequacy of Darwin's theory of Natural Selection to account for development of species has been demonstrated times out of mind, historically, mathematically, philosophically. It has ceased to be, with the learned, even an hypothesis. Yet the *Outline of Science* solemnly restates the old discredited process—Variation, Hereditary Transmission, the Struggle for Existence—as if its adequacy had never been challenged, as if blind chance, given time, could effect what human intelligence, working with all the inherited skill of the ages, has never been able to accomplish—the creation of a real and permanent new species. All the "genealogies," animal or vegetable, so plentifully supplied by writers of this class, are literally figments of the brain, or rather of the imagination. There is no support for the Evolution of Species in fossil Botany: the record of the rocks tells us nothing certain about the development of the horse or any other animal. There can be no objection to these fancies being put forward as what they are—conjectures based upon a few slight

indications which may just as well be interpreted otherwise. But again and again these ideas are stated as facts. Some consciousness of the dishonesty of this proceeding seems to have been awakened in a writer in the *Outline*. After stating (p. 274) that "it is quite illegitimate to infer from our dubiety in regard to the *factors* of evolution any hesitation as to the *fact*"—here, we notice, Darwinism is actually advanced from the sphere of hypothesis into that of reality—he goes on to say:

Our frankness in admitting difficulties [he nowhere fairly states, or resolutely faces them] and relative ignorance in regard to the variations and selections that led from certain Dinosaurs to Birds cannot be used by any fair-minded enquirer as an argument against the idea of evolution. *For how else could birds have arisen?* (Italics ours.)

The idea of special creation is apparently ruled absolutely out of court by this fair-minded Darwinian. No wonder that Mr. Holmes, wishing to recommend the idea of Evolution, is first of all at pains to destroy the trustworthiness of reason. Even Mr. A. R. Wallace, devoted Darwinian though he was, declared that at least thrice in the process of development a new force must have intervened to accomplish what no natural forces could effect, viz., the production of life, the production of sensation or consciousness, the production of reason. Why do Darwinians ignore Wallace, one inventor of the theory of natural selection, and pin their faith upon the other? Of course, palæontology in any case can only exhibit the material structural varieties of things, but even here there is a complete absence of gradation. There is progress in complexity of organization from epoch to epoch, but, on the other hand, each displays its particular forms quite abruptly and in relative perfection. One feels in reading evolutionary treatises that the facts are being explained (and sometimes explained away) to fit the theory, not that the theory has been drawn from the facts. The truth is, the rationalists, in their hurry to get rid of Creation and Design, have eagerly seized upon an hypothesis which, however superficially plausible, is essentially inadequate as an explanation of the genesis of species, and they do not see how they can retreat without discredit.

Such methods, practised now through several generations and perpetuated in text-books and museum-exhibits,

naturally provoke irritation amongst those who reverence Truth and respect Reason. Hence we are not surprised that, on the other side, there is a certain tone of acrimony and a certain violence of argument employed in dealing with the materialists. It would seem that the United States, always prolific in strange types, produces a larger crop of atheistic evolutionists than grows in the effete soil of Europe. Consequently we find there a corresponding output of vigorous hard-hitting literature devoted to the cause of sanity and truth. The opposition is excited, not so much by the theory of Evolution properly understood and supported, which, as we know, has many Catholic advocates, but by the unwarrantable extension of the theory to explain the origin of the human race. The dogmatic violence of the supporters of the simian relationship of man has provoked such a reaction that Mr. W. J. Bryan and others have projected a law to prevent the teaching of Darwinism in the schools of America. Certainly a Darwinism which destroys the notion of free-will and moral responsibility, and which thus strikes at the roots of civilization, might well be forbidden by law. And the practical atheism under the guise of Science, which flourishes in our Universities and in those of the States, is as real a menace to social well-being as the crude Marxianism and class-war taught in the Communistic "Red-Schools."

However, the follies and pretences of pseudo-science are best met by vigorous and persistent exposure. A volume, to which we have had occasion to allude more than once—Mr. A. McCann's *God—or Gorilla*<sup>1</sup>—admirably fulfils this necessary rôle. Its immediate occasion was the display, in the New York Museum of Natural History, of several cases containing supposed illustrations of the evolution of man. In these cases, models of all the much-debated skeletal fragments of palæolithic man are "reconstructed" and arranged chronologically to suggest his descent from some ancestor from whom have also descended the race of apes. This exhibit,<sup>2</sup> as it stands, and the accompanying guide-

<sup>1</sup> The Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> Our own museum at South Kensington is not altogether guiltless in the same regard: it contains the same fragments or models of them, as it undoubtedly should, but in the "reconstructions" and in the hand-book that describes the fossil remains there is the continuous suggestion 1) that the particular fragment represents a "type," and 2) that it shows more ape-like features the older it is. Some of these fanciful yet purposive "reconstructions" are represented in the *Outline of Science*. See THE MONTH, Oct. 1922, "Science or—Art?"

book, as much by what they assert as by what they ignore or conceal, form a constructive falsehood, devoted to bolstering up an unproven if not an exploded theory; accordingly, starting with this palmary instance of its deceptive methods, Mr. McCann proceeds to examine the whole field of atheistic evolution and to show how it prostitutes the fair name of Science, and grievously misleads those that trust in it. Aided by a large series of admirable illustrations, Mr. McCann proceeds on his savagely-facetious way, using a bludgeon where the late Editor of this periodical wielded a rapier,<sup>1</sup> and probably finding the weapon more effective on the heads with which he deals. He is not fighting science, but that masquerade of science which manipulates, exaggerates and suppresses facts in order to establish some favourite theory. At the same time, though his attack is on the whole sound and well-sustained, he sometimes overlooks points in favour of his adversaries. For instance, in dating these various prehistoric human remains scientific men rely a great deal upon the "cultural" evidence of the strata which contains them and upon the fossil remains of other animals whose range of existence is otherwise known. Although the union of the chimpanzee mandible with the human brain-pan in the case of the Piltdown skull is quite unwarranted, the remains can be proved early Pleistocene from the flints and other implements found with them. However, his book remains a convincing demonstration, not of the falseness of the evolutionary theory, which as a whole has been neither proved nor disproved, although the process suggested by Darwin has been found inadequate, but of the subterfuges and dishonesty of the materialists, and it should be found alongside Professor Windle's *Church and Science* in every Catholic library. For the endeavour to persuade men that they are evolved from brutes is radically inspired by the desire to get them free from the moral law and responsibility to a Creator. It is an endeavour which has long ago failed, as all would recognize if it were not for the conspiracy against the truth engineered by the pseudo-scientists. The result of their efforts has been declared once for all by Professor Virchow, a non-Catholic scientist of repute, who says: "Every positive advance which we have made in that study [prehistoric anthropology] has removed us

<sup>1</sup> See *Essays in Un-Natural History*, by Father John Gerard, now unhappily out of print in collected form. (C.T.S.)



further than before from any proof of evolution to be found there. Man has not descended from the ape nor has any ape-man ever existed."<sup>1</sup>

Amongst the facts that have discredited Darwinism and which on that account Darwinians rather ignore, the experiments of Abbot Mendel take first rank. They were published a few years after the publication of the *Origin of Species*, but the Abbot lacked advertisement, and his revolutionary discoveries were not really made public till 1900. They did not profess, as Darwin's theory did, to account for the emergence of new species, but they established facts which show the uselessness of Natural Selection. Mendel demonstrated that the cause of variations is something intrinsic, some property of the germ-cell which alternately acts and ceases to act according to a definite law. It leaves us with the old mystery—what determines the fixity of species, how did these very definite laws become inherent in living matter? True science is humble and confesses ignorance. False science pridefully tries to hide ignorance under a cloud of words. But the mystery remains as a constant spur to human curiosity.

Apart from the need of refuting the attempt to connect man with the brute, on the sole grounds of resemblance in bodily structure, the study of prehistoric times is one of great importance for our apologists. That the physical nature of the crown of creation should be, as it were, the basic idea on which the Creator has elaborated such a vast number of variations, is not surprising. But whilst resemblance can never be a proof of relationship, still, the doctrine of the Fall, taught by revelation, prepares us to find primitive man in a degraded condition. And so we always need, actively and consciously, to bring the impressions which we receive from the Genesis narrative into accord with the established facts of palæontology, or else we shall run the risk of adopting views not warranted by revelation. The first notion to get rid of is that foisted upon the Christian mind by the Biblical chronology of the Protestant Archbishop Ussher. Mr. Edmond Holmes, in his ignorance of the Catholic faith, imagines that we are bound to hold that the parents of the human race existed at the utmost some six thousand years ago.<sup>2</sup> That is demonstrably incorrect. Catholic chrono-

<sup>1</sup> Address at Weisbaden Congress of Naturalists.

<sup>2</sup> January *Hibbert Journal*, p. 243.

gists know that Genesis gives no certain data. Even the cautious and conservative Abbé Vigouroux, in his *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, sets down its chronology thus:

Creation . . . . .	?
Deluge . . . . .	?
Abraham leaves Ur . . . . .	2138 B.C.

So there may be gaps in the patriarchal record long enough to allow for physical degeneration, as well as for the moral corruption of which we read. Moreover, Archbishop Sheehan<sup>1</sup> significantly reminds us that, whilst we are bound to believe that the present human race are all descended from Adam and Eve, the Church has never condemned the opinion that a race of men lived on the earth, but became extinct before the creation of Adam. The Catholic apologist, as we have often pointed out, should be at great pains to ascertain the exact limits of revelation in regard to human origins and primitive history, for it is in that direction that the rationalist finds it easiest to advance to the attack. There is room for a detailed and popular "harmony" between the Book of Nature and the Bible which only those well acquainted with both should attempt. Such a reconciliation would at once satisfy the intellectual demands of the Catholic and provide him with a needed defence of the Faith. For the rationalist is most effectually discomfited when he finds that there are no real grounds of conflict between Church teaching and the assured results of scientific research.

#### THE EDITOR.

**NOTE.** It must not be implied from the foregoing that there is any real dearth of Catholic literature on subjects involving the reconciliation of revelation and science, but only that it is not available enough either for the young in their formative years or for the Catholic "man (or woman) in the street." The information that is contained in such books as that under review, Father Husslein's "Evolution and Social Progress," Professor Windle's "The Church and Science," "Moses and the Law," edited by Father Lattey, Father Gerard's "Old Riddle" and "Essays in Un-Natural History," Canon de Dorlodot's "Darwinism," Dr. P. L. Mills's "Creation versus Evolution," and a host of articles in the great Catholic Encyclopedia, needs digesting and simplifying for youthful consumption, and, for popular use, should be presented in a carefully thought-out series of C.T.S. pamphlets. False and misleading doctrines are already propagated in attractive form: truth should be elaborated with at least equal care.

<sup>1</sup> *Apologetics and Christian Doctrine*, Part II., p. 56.

## SOME PHYSICAL PHENOMENA OF MYSTICISM

### INCENDIUM AMORIS.

**T**HAT emotional ardours of a more intense type are often attended by an actual rise of bodily temperature may be regarded as a fact of everyday experience. There is nothing therefore particularly astonishing in the statements which we so often encounter in the lives of the great mystics, to the effect that when some transport of love took possession of their souls their countenances became inflamed, that they could hardly endure the clothing which seemed to stifle them, and that in the coldest of winter weather they threw open doors and windows, panting for air and half unconsciously seeking the same kind of relief as our Lord has indicated in His parable of Dives and Lazarus. Let us begin by taking a few well-known examples. In Father Goldie's *Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka* we read:

St. Francis de Sales in his book on the Love of God, says, "Stanislaus was so violently assailed by the love of Our Saviour as often to faint and to suffer spasms in consequence, and he was obliged to apply cloths dipped in cold water to his breast in order to temper the violence of the love he felt." One day he was found by his Superior walking alone at night time in the little garden which the Novitiate then possessed, when a very bitter cold wind was blowing, and on being asked by the Father Rector what he was doing there, he replied with all simplicity and straightforwardness, "I am burning, I am burning," as he felt his heart still on fire with the love of God, although his prayer was over. Stephen Augusti bore witness to the fact that the Socius to the Master of Novices, Father Lelius Sanguigni, had often to bathe his chest to temper the scorching heat.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly in the case of St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi, who was born in 1566, two years before St. Stanislaus died, we are told how her transports of love transformed her outward appearance, "for her face," says her biographer and confessor, Father Cepari, "losing in a moment the paleness which had been produced by her penances and austere re-

<sup>1</sup> *The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka*, pp. 136—137 (ed. 1893). This is based upon the details furnished in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, c. xiii., pp. 143-5.

ligious life, became glowing, beaming and full; her eyes shone and sparkled like stars, and she cried out, saying, 'O Love! O God of Love!' etc." But, more in particular, the same biographer, whose statements are in every way confirmed by the depositions of the witnesses who gave evidence in the process of beatification, declares that:

Sometimes, overpowered by the excess and abundance of this love, she said, "I can no longer bear so much love, retain it in Thyself;" and through the great and consuming flame of this Divine Love which she felt, she could find no rest, but tore her clothes, went into the garden and tore up the plants, or whatever came to hand. In the midst of winter she could not bear woollen garments, through that fire of love which burned in her breast, but cut and loosened her habit.

Or again:

Feeling so great a flame in her face, she fanned herself with her veil, then ran to the well and drank a quantity of fresh water, bathed her face and arms, poured it into her bosom, and so great was the flame which burned in her breast that even externally she seemed to consume.<sup>1</sup>

Not less remarkable was the devotional ardour of St. Philip Neri, the contemporary of both the saints last named.

Philip [says Father Bacci] felt such a heat in the region of the heart, that it sometimes extended over his whole body, and for all his age, thinness and spare diet, in the coldest days of winter it was necessary, even in the midst of the night, to open the windows, to cool the bed, to fan him while in bed, and in various ways to moderate the great heat. Sometimes it quite burned his throat, and in all his medicines something cooling was generally mixed to relieve him. Cardinal Crescenzi, one of his spiritual children, said that sometimes when he touched his hand, it burned as if the saint was suffering from a raging fever. . . . Even in winter he almost always had his clothes open from the girdle upwards, and sometimes when they told him to fasten them lest he should do himself some injury, he used to say he really could not because of the excessive heat he felt. One day, at Rome, when a great quantity of snow had fallen, he was walking in the streets with his cassock unbuttoned; and when some of his penitents, who were with him were hardly able to endure the cold, he laughed at them and said it was a shame for young men to feel cold when old men did not.

<sup>1</sup> Oratorian Translation, pp. 235—237.

Elsewhere the biographer records how—

Sometimes in saying office, or after Mass, or in any other spiritual action, sparks, as it were of fire, were seen to dart from his eyes and from his face. This inward fire was such that it sometimes made him swoon, forcing him to throw himself on his bed, where he is said to have lain occasionally a whole day without any other sickness than that of divine love. On one occasion it so burned his throat that he was ill for several days.<sup>1</sup>

There can be little doubt that the discovery which was made in the autopsy performed after St. Philip's death must be closely connected with the same intense fervour of divine love. During more than fifty years of his long life he had suffered from a strange and inexplicable palpitation of the heart, which was noticed, not only by himself, but by many of his companions and friends whom in the tenderness of his affection for their souls he often pressed to his bosom. The surgeons, when they opened his body, found a swelling under his left breast, which proved to be due to the fact that two of his ribs were broken and thrust outwards. In view of the positive testimony of the surgeons, there can be no dispute that the injury was there and had been there for many years. His biographers seem therefore fully justified in tracing it to that strange incident of the coming to him of the Holy Ghost in 1544 under the guise of a globe of fire. "Thereupon," we are told, "he was suddenly surprised by such an ardour of love that, unable to bear it, he threw himself down upon the ground, and, like one trying to cool himself, bared his breast, to temper in some measure the flame which he felt." Certain it is in any case that from that time forth his body was liable in moments of deep emotional feeling to tremble convulsively with intense palpitations, while he became conscious of the presence of a swelling on the left breast, the size of a man's fist. This he retained for all the rest of his life.<sup>2</sup> It is curious that a displacement of the ribs, similar in cause and character, but apparently less in degree, is recorded in the case of St. Paul of the Cross, the founder of the Passionists, who lived two centuries later. An even more striking modern example is

<sup>1</sup> Bacci, *Life of St. Philip Neri*, edited by Father Antrobus (1902), Vol. I., pp. 26, 141.

<sup>2</sup> The fullest account of the autopsy will be found in the *Life* by Father Gallonio, St. Philip's intimate friend and disciple. See AA. SS. May, vi., 510. Capecciatro (Eng. Trans. II., 463) and the Bollandists do not quite agree as to the names of the surgeons. But the medical testimony given on oath seems to have been submitted in the process of Beatification. Several of the Oratorian Fathers were also present at the autopsy.

that of Gemma Galgani (*Life*, pp. 259, 352, 423), who died at Lucca in 1903.

Nevertheless, such physical manifestations as these, however wonderful in themselves, can hardly be regarded as witnessing to any abnormal increase of the temperature of the body. So long as we have no evidence of a more objective kind than the mystic's longing for fresh air or cool water, or his statement that he is suffering from a sensation of suffocation and burning heat, there obviously is nothing which takes us beyond the range of the symptoms which may be observed in any hospital fever-ward. None the less, the claim is made in many hagiographical writings that phenomena do occasionally occur for which no parallel can be found in the pathological records known to medical science. I have heard it stated, for example, that in the case of Padre Pio da Pietrelcina, the young Capuchin priest of Foggia, who is marked with the stigmata, the clinical thermometer used by his doctor in visiting him professionally has on more than one occasion been unable to register the high temperature of the patient, and has consequently been broken by the unprecedented expansion of the mercury within. The same allegation has also been made to me, by persons who seemed to be well informed, in connection with another modern mystic. But in neither case have I authority which I could quote in print. In earlier ages, of course, there were no clinical thermometers, and the only proofs which can be offered in evidence are of a much ruder description. Still, some such tests are recorded in hagiographical literature, and the authenticity of these alleged examples affords interesting matter for discussion.

Probably the best-known case is that of St. Catherine of Genoa, which, thanks in large measure to the very learned and painstaking study of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, has been brought to the notice of many English readers for whom the ordinary Saint's Life offers little attraction. St. Catherine was a mystic of the seraphic type, and perhaps nothing more beautiful has ever been printed about the love of God than is to be found in the utterances and writings attributed to this noble Genoese matron. Assuming for the moment the authenticity of the whole content of the *Vita e Dottrina di Santa Caterina da Genova*, which was first published in 1551, we find that the book abounds in references to the extraordinary physical state into which



Catherine was frequently thrown by the intensity of her consuming love. Quite at the beginning, and in reference to her "great fasts," which lasted from 1476 to 1499, it is stated that, for twenty-three lents and as many advents, the Saint took no solid food at all, but occasionally drank a glassful of a beverage compounded of water, vinegar and pounded salt.

When she drank this mixture it seemed as if it were thrown upon a red-hot flag-stone and that it was at once dried up in the great fire which was burning within her. An astounding and unheard of thing! For no digestion, however healthy, could bear a drink of this kind fasting, but she declared that the interior sweetness she experienced was so great that even this unpalatable beverage gave refreshment to her body.<sup>1</sup>

I omit chance references which seem to point to some similar state of suffering which recurred at intervals during the intervening years. What is certain is that in her last sickness, which continued from January to September, 1510, she was over and over again the victim of sensations of intense burning. For example:

On one day she was stabbed with a still sharper arrow of the divine love. . . . The wound (*ferita*) was so poignant that she lost speech and sight, and abode in this manner some three hours. . . . She made signs with her hands of feeling as if it were red-hot pincers attacking her heart and other interior parts.

Later on there was a day when she suffered such an intensity of burning that it was impossible to keep her in bed. She seemed like a creature placed in a great flame of fire, so much so that human eyes could not endure the spectacle of such a martyrdom. This anguish lasted a whole day and night and it was impossible to touch her skin because of the acute pain which she felt from any such touch.<sup>2</sup>

But this was by no means all. We are told a little later of another attack (*assalto*)—

This was so violent that her whole frame seemed to be in a tremble, especially her right shoulder (which appeared as though severed from her body, and similarly one rib seemed to be forced out of its place with so much pain, anguish and racking of muscles and bones, that it was a terrible thing to

<sup>1</sup> *Vita e Dottrina*, Genova, 1847, pp. 10—11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152. No one who recalls the details given in one of my Stigmatization articles regarding Domenica Lazzari (see *THE MONTH*, Oct. 1919, pp. 294—295) can fail to note the many points of resemblance between her case and that of St. Catherine.

look upon, and it seemed impossible that a human body could endure it).<sup>1</sup>

The words which I have enclosed in brackets are regarded by Baron von Hügel as not forming part of the primitive text of the *Vita*, in spite of the fact—so at least I infer from him—that they are found in the manuscripts as well as in the first printed edition of 1551. He asserts, in regard both of the alleged injury to the shoulder and the displaced rib, that these details "have precisely the same 'colour,' and no doubt proceed from the same contributor, as the longer passage relative to her supposed stigmatization, absent from all the MSS., but given in the printed *Vita* on the authority of Argentina."<sup>2</sup> It requires, I think, a very robust sceptic to reject nowadays the possibility of the phenomena of stigmatization, and some injury to the shoulder is of frequent occurrence in the case of stigmatized persons. To take but a single example, the *post mortem* examination of the body of St. Veronica Giuliani attested the existence of "a very considerable curvature of the right shoulder, which bent the very bone just as the weight of a heavy cross might have done." The surgeon, Gentili, who performed the autopsy, stated in his sworn deposition that "if this curvature had occurred by natural means it would have prevented her moving her arm, but I have myself frequently seen Sister Veronica during her last illness move her right arm without the least difficulty."<sup>3</sup> But whatever we may think of the inference thus drawn, there can be no reasonable doubt of the fact that some extraordinary deflection of St. Veronica's right shoulder was observable, together with the marks of the five wounds, when her body was examined on July 10, 1727, thirty-four hours after her death. Now the *Vita e Dottrina*, as we have it, was actually printed in 1551, so that such precedents as St. Philip Neri's displaced ribs, and St. Veronica Giuliani's flexed clavicle could not possibly have been known to the compilers. Consequently it seems, in my judgment, much saner to suppose that these additional details, if additions they were, are derived from Argentina's faithful memory of what her eyes

<sup>1</sup> *Vita e Dottrina*, p. 154. *Una costa levata dall' altre* are the words of the original.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mystical Element of Religion*, I., 197, note.

<sup>3</sup> Salvatori, *Life of St. Veronica Giuliani* (Eng. Trans.), p. 163. This biography is based upon the evidence given in the process of Beatification, and its statements of fact may be regarded as trustworthy.

actually saw in St. Catherine's last illness, than to attribute them to the fervid imaginations of irresponsible panegyrists.

But the most curious and interesting record of the internal conflagration by which the last remnants of Catherine's vitality were consumed has still to be noticed. On August 28th, when the tragedy of suffering began to near its end, she was again all on fire. She cried aloud that "all the water which the world contains could not give me the least refreshment." Later her tongue and lips became so parched with the burning heat within that she could not move them or speak. At such times, if anyone touched a hair of her head, or even the edge of the bed, or the bedclothes, she would scream as if she had been stabbed. Her confessor sometimes hesitated to bring her Communion in this state, for she could swallow nothing, neither food or drink, "but, with a joyous face, she would make him a sign that she was not afraid, and then, when she had received, she remained with her countenance glowing and rosy, like that of a Seraph."<sup>1</sup>

An explanation of all this suffering was afterwards given by her devoted handmaid, Argentina, who declared that Catherine had predicted it before it came about, and had confided to her that before her death she was destined to endure the sufferings of our Lord's Passion, together with the anguish of the five wounds (the Stigmata), at least interiorly, on account of the great love she bore to her Saviour and her desire to resemble Him in all things.<sup>2</sup>

None the less, it is added that Catherine never allowed a word to escape her in public which could throw light upon the cause of these torments and betray their entirely supernatural character.<sup>3</sup> When Argentina also bears witness that her mistress, throwing out her arms in the form of a cross, presented the counterpart of her crucified Saviour, one of her arms being stretched more than five inches beyond its natural length,<sup>4</sup> I must confess that this detail, instead of discrediting her statement, as Baron von Hügel declares it to do, seems to me to supply a notable confirmation of the general trustworthiness of our witness. Certain it is, in any

<sup>1</sup> *Vita e Dottrina*, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 167—168.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 168. "Giammai disse pure una parola donde si prodecessero tante pene."

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* "Ebbe (Caterina) grandissima pena ad un braccio, di tal sorte che si allungò più di mezzo palmo del solito."

case, that when the Blessed Stefana Quinzani in 1497 represented in ecstasy the incidents of the Passion of our Lord, her left arm in the crucifixion scene was "stretched considerably beyond its natural length" (*assai sopra la lunghezza sua naturale*<sup>1</sup>). If Argentina was romancing, it is extraordinary that she should have embellished her story with just those striking features for which parallels, attested by the best of evidence, can be found in the case of other mystics. No doubt it may be said that Argentina might easily have read or heard an account of Blessed Stefana Quinzani's ecstasies which took place in 1497. This is true, but it is much more likely that the story would have been known to an educated lady like her mistress, St. Catherine, and in that case it is quite conceivable that the impression made upon Catherine's mind may have contributed to produce the same physical phenomenon in her own mystical transports.

During the whole of the Saint's last illness, and especially in its closing phases, these long-protracted seizures, characterized by a sensation of intense burning (*juoco*), are a constantly recurring feature. In particular, the printed *Vita* records two special occasions when material proof was given of the intensity of the heat developed. Let me copy the first in Baron von Hügel's translation:

In proof that this holy woman bore the stigmata interiorly, a large silver cup was ordered to be brought in, which had a very high standing saucer; the cup was full of cold water for refreshing her hands, in the palms of which, because of the great fire that burned within her, she felt intolerable pain. And on putting her hands into it, the water became so boiling that the cup and the very saucer were greatly heated.<sup>2</sup>

One is conscious of a certain temerity in differing from an authority who has devoted so much time and so much learning to the elucidation of his subject; moreover, I can make no claim to any expert knowledge of Italian. Nevertheless, I find it hard to accept the Baron's rendering of this passage, and still more his rejection of the whole incident as unhistorical. To begin with, the "large silver

<sup>1</sup> See a paper of mine in the *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, Vol. XXXII., p. 196; and cf. the account I have given of the elongations of the Ven. Veronica Laparelli in *Journal S.P.R.*, Vol. XIX. (1919), pp. 51 seq. The phenomena in Blessed Stefana's case were attested by the signed and sealed declaration of twenty-one eye-witnesses.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mystical Element of Religion*, I., 452. The original Italian occurs in the *Vita e Dottrina* (ed. Genova, 1847), p. 167.

cup" (*gran tazza d'argento*) was surely a standing cup with a stem and a shallow bowl, more or less like an exaggerated champagne glass in form, though probably the stem was shorter in proportion. Cups and saucers were not known in Europe until long afterwards, and, in any case, there is no mention of a "saucer," but simply of the *piede della tazza*, the stem or pedestal of the cup. Anyone who leaves a silver spoon in a cup of hot tea is apt to discover with a start that silver is an excellent conductor of heat. It seems to me natural to suppose that Argentina made a similar discovery. She had carried the cup in by its pedestal full of the coolest water she could procure. After St. Catherine had bathed her hands Argentina came to remove it and the stem burned her when she touched it. Such an incident is likely to have impressed itself upon her memory, and the use of the word *bollente* (boiling) is only a very natural exaggeration. She was surprised to find that the stem had become unpleasantly hot.

Between the 13th of September and the 15th, on which last day she died, Catherine lost immense quantities of blood. The temperature of this discharge, we are told in the *Vita*, was such that (1) it heated the vessels in which it was caught; (2) it scalded her flesh wherever it touched it, so that the places had to be cooled with rose-water; (3) being on one occasion received in a silver cup, it heated the base of the cup and left a mark which could never be washed out.<sup>1</sup> Baron von Hügel comments that only the first of these observations is to be found in the manuscripts, and that "purely secondary, physical matters are thus, with a short-sighted good faith and admiration, eagerly utilized to naturalize and obscure a soaringly spiritual personality."<sup>2</sup> No doubt it is true that these physical matters are "purely secondary"; but after all, for our present inquiry, the question is, Is the statement accurate? If these things did happen they were worth recording, and while I agree that the evidence taken by itself is not conclusive, we cannot ignore the precisely similar declarations which have been made by eye-witnesses in the case of other mystics.

<sup>1</sup> *Vita e Dottrina*, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mystical Element of Religion*, I., 214. Without disputing the possibility, and even the likelihood, of subsequent interpolations in such a work, I must confess myself frankly distrustful of all attempts to reconstruct the primitive text. Textual criticism is a very necessary science, but it offers many pitfalls to the pioneer who easily allows conjecture to crystallize into assurance.

Let us take for example the instance of the Venerable Serafina di Dio, a Carmelite nun of Capri, who died in 1699. Her life, which was written by the two Oratorian Fathers, Sguillante and Pagani, was published at Rome in 1748. They seem to have based it almost entirely upon the evidence furnished in the Process of Beatification. In this biography we read:

Her nuns say that they have often seen her—for example, when she was in prayer, or after Communion—with her face glowing like a flame and her eyes sparkling. It scorched them if they touched her, even in winter time and even when she was quite old, and they declared that they had repeatedly heard her say that she was consumed with a living fire and that her blood was boiling. Her throat, palate and lips became so parched that it was necessary to cool them with fresh water; but this expedient by no means sufficed to allay the burning she felt. . . .

The doctors, who did not understand the cause of her sufferings, applied many kinds of cooling remedies and frequently bled her; while our Saviour Himself, in order to give her some relief, especially when these blood-boilings (*li bollori del sangue*) lasted for two or three days, as was often the case at times when she entertained an intense desire to die a martyr, so disposed matters that she lost great quantities of blood through the nostrils or by the mouth. It was a matter of intense astonishment to all observers to see a body so emaciated as hers lose such a vast quantity of blood without being incapacitated for everyday duties.<sup>1</sup>

Those who are familiar with the story of St. Catherine of Genoa will remember that, in her case too, her recoveries were as marvellous as the mysterious indispositions which repeatedly brought her to death's door. But the most striking phenomenon recorded in the Life of the Venerable Serafina is the statement made regarding her holy remains after she breathed her last:

For the space of twenty hours the body retained so great a heat, particularly in the region of the heart, that one could comfortably warm one's hand by holding it there, as many of the nuns discovered on making the experiment. Indeed the warmth was perceptible for thirty-three hours after death, though somewhat less in degree, in spite of the fact that the month was March and the weather chilly. The corpse did not completely lose its heat until it had been opened and the heart extracted.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sguillante and Pagani, *Vita della Ven. Serafina di Dio*, Rome, 1748, p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 462.



One's first instinct is to conclude that the nuns and their doctor must have been mistaken in supposing that life was extinct, but there are a good many similar cases, and it is difficult to believe that mystics, after long and exhausting illnesses, were peculiarly exposed to the danger of being buried alive.

Take, for example, the case of the Dominican nun, Suor Maria Villani at Naples. She died on March 26, 1670, at the age of 86, and her *Life* was published four years afterwards, in a volume of more than 600 pages, by Father Francis Marchese, O.P. In his very first sentence the biographer informs us that his heroine was a furnace of love, and this is the note upon which he harps throughout the whole book. It is plain, also, from the letters and other writings of the Sister herself, that the idea that she was continually consumed by an almost insupportable flame of love dominated all her thoughts. The *Life* states that the physical effects of this interior conflagration were such as to compel her to drink as much as 36, and sometimes even 45, *libre* of water in a day. I do not exactly know the English equivalent of the Neapolitan measure of a *libra*, but 36 *libre* probably falls not much short of 28 pints or three gallons and a half. Moreover, we are told that the drinking of this was attended by a hissing sound like that of water falling on a sheet of red-hot iron.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible not to suspect a certain amount of exaggeration in all this, but on the other hand, there are definite physical facts connected with the case which cannot readily be explained away. Suor Maria believed that she had been wounded in the side and heart by a fiery spear of love, and there is good evidence that the wound was really there. At any rate, her biographer prints three formal depositions signed by three of her confessors, who had been permitted, at different times, to see, touch and even probe the external wound. These Fathers were well-known Dominicans, and one, Lonardo di Lettere, had a great reputation for sanctity, so that the cause of his Beatification was introduced after his death. The *Life* of Maria Villani appeared with the fullest ecclesiastical sanc-

<sup>1</sup> Marchese, *Vita della Serva di Dio, Suor Maria Villani* (Napoli, 1674), pp. 203—204. An exactly similar statement is made by Canon Martinon regarding his penitent the Venerable Agnes of Jesus, a French Dominican nun. He declares that he himself had been present when water was poured upon her breast to cool her in her transports of burning fervour, and that the water sizzled like water poured on to red-hot iron. Luest, *Vie de la V. Agnès de Jésus*, II., p. 134.

tion, and both the General of the Dominicans and the Cardinal Archbishop of Naples gave it their *imprimatur*. But perhaps the most remarkable statement which the book contains is the account of the opening of the body nine hours after death. The corpse of this woman of 86, which, when she breathed her last, had been dried up, emaciated and dark in hue, became fresh-coloured and supple like that of a living person. When the surgeon opened the breast, a quantity of bright fluid blood issued both from the incision made and from the heart. Some of this blood, the biographer assures us, had been preserved in two little flasks, and at the time of writing (1673) still remained liquid and incorrupt. But what most astonished the onlookers present at the autopsy was "the smoke (*fumo*) and heat which exhaled from the heart, that veritable furnace of divine love." The surgeon found the heat too trying to proceed. He was compelled to draw back for a while, but afterwards returning, "he put in his hand to extract the heart, but he found it so hot, that burning himself (*scottandosi*), he was compelled to take his hand out again several times before he succeeded in effecting his purpose." The biographer declares that a formal affidavit regarding these facts was made by the surgeons Domenico Trifone and Francesco Pinto.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the heart itself, an open wound was found in it of the very same form and shape as the dead nun had drawn with her own hand on a page of her tractate, *De tribus divinis flammis*. "This wound (in the heart)," the biographer goes on, "I have seen and touched and examined. The lips of the wound are hard and seared, just as happens when the cautery is used, to remind us, no doubt, that it was made with a spear of fire."<sup>2</sup>

There are other examples more or less similar to those of Serafino di Dio and Maria Villani, but I have no room to discuss them at any length. It must be sufficient to note that in the case of the Franciscan missionary, the Ven. Antonio Margil, an apostle who was often seen raised in the air in his ecstasies of love, it is stated that after death "his face which had been pale during lifetime became of a beautiful rosy hue, his eyes remained bright and his limbs flexible, while his flesh continued warm down to the moment when his

<sup>1</sup> *Vita di Maria Villani*, pp. 609—610. This statement must carry some weight when we remember that the book was published in Naples itself, and that less than four years had elapsed since the autopsy took place.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 610.

body was consigned to the tomb."<sup>1</sup> So, again, we are told of Blessed Andrew Ibernnon, another holy Franciscan who was entirely penetrated with the seraphic spirit of the Poor Man of Assisi, "it was observed when they laid his body in the coffin (three days after death) that the flesh was still warm and soft, and all the sinews and muscles flexible, just as if he had only expired the moment before."<sup>2</sup> These two Lives last mentioned were written in each case by the Postulator of the Cause, who had all the sworn depositions before him.

Among other instances of phenomenal heat manifestations might be cited the case of the Venerable Rosa Maria Serio († 1725), Prioress of the Carmelite convent of Fasano, who for seven successive years had an extraordinary experience on Whit-Sunday. On the first occasion a ball of fire descended upon her visibly in the sight of all the nuns. When they undressed her they found her underlinen above the breast burned in the form of a heart. The same burning took place for six other years, but there was no visible ball of fire.<sup>3</sup> Again in the Life of the Venerable Francesca dal Serrone († 1601), a Franciscan nun who, like Maria Villani, had a wound in the side, we read that the blood, which on certain occasions came from her side or was vomited by the mouth, was so hot that it cracked an earthenware vessel used to receive it, and had to be caught in a metal bowl.<sup>4</sup> Similarly of St. Theresa's companion, the Carmelite Agnes of Jesus, as well as of two or three other candidates for beatification, we are told that in some of her illnesses, the nuns who nursed her could hardly touch her flesh on account of the burning heat.<sup>5</sup> The evidence for these cases is inconclusive, but it is certainly not contemptible.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. Gusman, *Notizie della Vita etc del Ven. Fr. Antonio Margil* (Rome, 1836), p. 102. He died at Mexico in 1726 at the age of 69.

<sup>2</sup> V. Mondina, *Vita del Beato Andrea Ibernnon* (Rome, 1791), p. 172. Blessed Andrew Ibernnon was 68 years old when he died at Gandia in Spain in 1602.

<sup>3</sup> G. Gentili, S.J., *Vita della Ven. Madre Rosa Maria Serio (Venezia, 1741)*, Preface, p. vii., and pp. 34 and 74-75.

<sup>4</sup> G. B. Cancellotti, S.J., *Vita della Ven. Francesca dal Serrone* (Rome, 1665), pp. 29-30, 134, and 154 seq.

<sup>5</sup> Berthold-Ignace, *Vie de la Mère Anne de Jésus* (Malines, 1882), Vol. II., p. 493.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### A NOTE ON JAMES MYAGH

**I**N the issue of *THE MONTH* for August, 1922, Dr. W. H. Grattan Flood, in his interesting answer to the question, "Who was Thomas Myagh of the Tower?" had occasion to identify Thomas's brother, James Meagh, as James MacKedagh O'More, who became Chief of Leix in 1578, and died about June 19, 1584.

The State Paper hereinafter printed is calendared July, 1586, but there seems to be little doubt that the James Meage who is the subject of it is to be identified with the Chief of Leix, and that it belongs to the year 1584.

In the first paragraph, James Meage claims credit for having prevented Daniel McCarthy More, Earl of Clancarty, joining Gerald FitzGerald, Earl of Desmond, in the rebellion set on foot originally by James FitzMaurice FitzGerald and Dr. Nicolas Sander. The English Government, however, must have been quite well aware that in fact Clancarty had joined with James of Desmond, the Earl's brother, in taking and sacking Kinsale in November, 1579. Moreover, shortly after the arrival of two foreign ships at Dingle Harbour on January 28, 1580, one Maurice O'Madden had been captured by the Earl of Ormonde, and had declared that after the coming of the ships a solemn oath had passed between Desmond and Clancarty to join together with their forces, "which oath was ministered by the Doctor [Sander], having a mass-book under their feet and a cloth spread over their heads." However, in the beginning of March, Clancarty had been overawed by Ormonde, and on March 12, before Glin Castle, on the Shannon, was presented to the Lord Justice, Sir William Pelham, and made his submission. Yet when Pelham summoned him to appear before him on May 10th, Clancarty not only did not appear, nor send any excuse, but, on the contrary, sent 400 gallowglasses to Desmond's relief. Thomas O'Herbhy, Bishop of Ross, who had joined Desmond with Clancarty, had been provided to the see of

Ross, December 17, 1561, and was one of the three Irish bishops who attended the later sessions of the Council of Trent. He was at this time suffering from dropsy and died early in 1580.

The second paragraph about the cloth is interesting. It does not seem to be mentioned by anyone else. Though only four yards long, and not, as Froude states, forty, it was yet too big to have been carried into battle, and the papal standard that we hear of elsewhere must have been something much smaller. This cloth was certainly not brought from Rome by Sander, who had never met FitzMaurice when he left Rome in September, 1573, and it is improbable that it had accompanied FitzMaurice in his journeyings since he left Rome in the spring of 1577, though it may have done. The "towe weomen imadges" were probably Our Lady and St. John. The "poesey" was FitzMaurice's constant motto, and he often used it in signing his letters. With regard to the Masses said by Sander, we find on September 16, 1579,\* William Gerard, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and Dean of St. Patrick's (who was knighted on the following October 11th), writing in this exaggerated vein to Lord Burghley: "That devilish traitor Sanders I heard—by examination of some persons who were in the forte with him and heard his four or five masses a day—that he persuadeth all men that it is lawful to kill any English Protestants, and that he hath authoritie to warrant all such from the Pope, and absolution to all who can so draw blood."

The last paragraph probably refers to an event in April, 1580. On March 17th, Sir William Winter had been appointed Admiral in command of three ships then in English waters, the *Swiftsure* (400 tons), the *Tiger* (200 tons), and the *Martin* (? the *Merlin*, 50 tons), and two ships already in Irish waters, the *Achates* (100 tons) and the *Handmaid*; on April 7th he was at Kinsale. After the end of May, there was no doubt of Clancarty's having definitely ranged himself on the Queen's side, though the attitude of his only legitimate son and of his two bastards still remained very doubtful.

Probably James Meage thought it better not to carry his history any farther than the spring of 1580, for in the summer he himself was hand in glove with James Eustace, Viscount Baltinglas, and fighting against the Queen, though, as Dr. Flood has pointed out, he had gone to submit himself

to the then Lord Deputy, Lord Grey, on September 21st of that year.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE.

*State Papers Ireland, Elizabeth (1586, July).*

*Vol. 125 No. 4.*

Certaine particular notes of offices don by James Myage for hir maiestie sins the begeninge of the late rebellion in Mounster.

First wheare the traitor the late Earle of Desmonde and his wicked bretheren (havings drawen unto them for the moste parte all the forces of Mounster) besought wth greate offers of landes goods and all other meanes possible to allure thearle of Clancartie to joyne wth them in that theire wicked action. The said James thereof having notice, and fynding the said Earle of Clancartie verie willinge to contynewe his loyaltie towards hir highnes: partly thereby, and chiefly for that in matters concerneinge the same he dyvers tymes tofore followed the said James his advise, was emboldened apon so good an accasion mynistred, and for the better preferment of hir mates service, to wryte his letters to the said Earle thearby exhortinge him not in eny wise to declyne from his loyaltie, but alwaies to call to mynde hir highnes moste bountifull rewardes and moste honorable dignitie bestowed apon him. And perceivinge also that the said traitors repaired into Desmonde (accompanied wth Doctor Saunders and the bisshoppe Ohierlihie) the soner to put in practise their pretended wicked attempts the said James in greate dainger of his lyfe often tymes travailed towards the said Earle of Clancartie unto whome he showed such strong reasons as thereby he plainly understoode the emynent dainger if he had once declyned from hir matie wher apon the said Earle utterly rejectinge the said offers, moste of his gent. and followers universallie bent to the acte of rebellion, leaving him destitute of all kynde of maintenance, soddainely departed and forsooke him. Whearfore and in respecte the said Earle followed the said James his counseill as before, and that he made his repaire to Corcke and other places as often as the said James had sente for him to appeare before the lo: president or eny other hir mates governo:rs for the tyme beinge the said James intertained the said Earle in his owne house wheare he furnished him wth all kynde of necessities duringe his contynuance wth him to the said James his intollerable chardges & greate costes.

(Item) apon a tyme that the said James made a journey to Desmonde, he tooke from certain of the traitor John of Desmond his men a painted cloath fouere yeardes longe, wch cloath the traitors James Maurice and Doctoure Saunders broughte from Roome, in the mydest of wch cloath was sumpteously drawn the



said traitor James his armes wth the redd draggon and many other ceremonyes aboute it: as the pictures of tow e aungelles uphouldinge the said armes, and over it the figure of the Crosse, wth the portraiture of Oure Lorde and the picture of tow e weomen imadges aboute it also, and under the saide armes in greate romaine letters this poesey written: *In omni tribulatione et angustia spes nra Jesus et Maria*. This cloathe at everie masse or sermon that doctoure Saunders had in the field was sett upp and spread abroad upon stakes in the face of all the people. Which cloath the said James delyvered upp to the Lord Deputey.

(Item) at the tyme that William Wynter wth certaine of hir mates shippes came apon the coaste of Irelande and arrived in the haven of Corcke, at whiche time it was reported thorough the oute the country that the Earle of Clancartie had entered into action of rebellion wth thearle of Desmonde; forasmuche as the said James thoughte the contrary he directed letters to the said Earle willinge him to come to Corcke to disprove that sclanderous reporte so given oute of him. Wheare after his cominge and lodginge at the said James his house the said James advised the said Earle for the better manifestation of his loyalte to hir Matie to goe aboorde thadmirall of the saide shippes wthoute either protection or woorde and theare to offer himselfe at hir highnes pleasure. Whiche beinge so done and soone after knowen was as greate griefe to all those that weare at that tyme in rebellion and most wickedly enclyned, as it was joye and comforte to all such as weare dutifully disposed in that country.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

### The Relapse of the Bolshevik.

The madmen who rule in Soviet Russia and are persecuting Christianity there are again showing that intransigence in foreign relations which marked their first seizure of power. The inevitable breakdown of their foolish Marxian economics was followed in March, 1921, by an endeavour to get the world to trade with them again. Lenin, being compelled to admit the necessity of capital for industrial development, negotiated a trade agreement with this country, the first and, we believe, the only member of the Allies to grant the Bolsheviks even that degree of recognition. At Genoa a year later they failed, because of their shiftiness in regard to debts and contracts, to secure any further admittance into the comity of nations. Now that they have taken the satanic resolve to extirpate religion, the meagre measure of sanity that they have latterly shown appears to have deserted them. They have resumed anti-British propaganda in the East and have been com-

mitting outrages on British trawlers in extra-territorial waters. Diplomatic representations have proved of no avail, and at last the Government have threatened to denounce the trade agreement unless the Bolsheviks give satisfaction by a certain date. We trust that the threat will be effective. Although the Bolsheviks deserve to be treated only as criminals and outcasts, the foes of humanity and Christianity alike, still the destinies of millions of poor peasants are still in their hands, and a renewed ostracism of the Russian Government, a practical blockade, would only result in a repetition of those horrors of starvation which have so grievously afflicted that unhappy people.

**Antichrist  
in  
Russia.**

In a notable article in the *Catholic Times* for April 28th, Mgr. Canon Barry, whom we may be permitted to congratulate on the attainment of his sacerdotal jubilee and on the dignity of Protonotary Apostolic conferred on him by the Pope, recalls a prediction made by Cardinal Manning sixty years ago as to the consequences of the spoliation of the Holy See and the gradual elimination of religious influences from public, civil, and political life. Secularism has triumphed in many States; a disintegrating Protestantism cannot hold it back. Only Christ's Church can effectively resist Antichrist, and to-day Catholicism is the rallying ground of all that have eyes to see the approaching menace. There are those in England who, in the interests of the fetish of uniformity advocate the practical exclusion of religion from education. The Bolsheviks are more honest and logical, and make it a crime to teach religion to any below the age of 18. Of all the signs of the approach of Antichrist, this secularization of education, especially of the education of the children of the poor, is the most conspicuous. The Universities may be, as they are, largely staffed by agnostics, public-school religious training may be, as it is, a byword: these evils affect a comparatively small number. But withhold religion from the multitude, and you are preparing the land for Bolshevism. In Soviet Russia Manning's prophecy has actually been realized. Antichrist, in the person of those apostate Jews, is already in power. Marx, another apostate Jew, is his evangelist, and Christianity, especially the Catholicism of Rome, is the object of his bitterest hatred. The English press, more we fear for political reasons than for religious, has expressed its horror at the persecution, but why has no paper given a full account of it? <sup>1</sup> One has to read American journals to learn the full iniquity of those proceedings which resulted in the condemnation, in Holy Week, of Archbishop Zepliak, Mgr. Butkevitch, and

<sup>1</sup> We have since learned, and are glad to record, that Captain McCullagh's report appeared also in a recent issue of *The Spectator*.

the other Catholic confessors, for the crime of professing and teaching the Catholic faith. To the honour of the *New York Herald*, it secured a full first-hand report of the trial through the enterprize of its correspondent, Capt. Francis McCullagh. It was this same Francis McCullagh, we may remember, who, with Sir Philip Gibbs, was instrumental in exposing the inner workings and motives of that other anti-Catholic outburst, the Portuguese Revolution, which nearly all the press of this country welcomed or condoned. His despatch from Petrograd, which may be seen in *The Catholic Mind*<sup>1</sup> for May 8th, reads like a description of a trial of an émigré under the Terror, or of a seminary priest in the reign of Elizabeth. It was a cruel travesty of justice, rendered more horrible by the diabolical malice of prosecutor and judge. Yet even here those fiends have their admirers, and nothing has so injured the reputation and prospects of the Labour party as the support given by its press and by certain of its members to these enemies of mankind.

**The Turk  
at  
Lausanne.**

The late Sir Mark Sykes, expert in all things concerning the Turk and not indisposed to view him with kindness, would be shocked beyond measure by a visit to Lausanne to-day.

For there he would find the Turk, most venal and unprincipled of all our enemies in the late war, most incapable of civilized government, most barbarous in his treatment of subject races, dealing *de haut en bas* with the Allied representatives, making "concessions," dictating terms, ignoring altogether a certain Treaty of Sèvres, which had all but banished him from Europe, and made very little of him in Asia. This Treaty was never ratified, owing to want of harmony between England and France, and the military ineptitude and ambition of the Greeks. And now the most insignificant Power in Europe has manoeuvred itself into the position of a conqueror, and the great nations instead of exacting indemnities for its wanton interference in the war, are treating with it for concessions. Had Mark Sykes lived and had his way the humiliation of Lausanne would never have occurred. But even when he lived he had not his way. He drafted the Armistice terms but said of them, "I had at least this compliment that every term which I personally inserted was knocked out by the Turks." As a consequence, the "ridiculous Armistice terms were taken by the Turks as a great victory for themselves"—so early had Allied dissension begun to appear. And the sad result is that, so far as the settlement of the "Turkish problem" is concerned, the Great War has been practically wasted. The Turk came in unprovoked, prolonged the conflict

<sup>1</sup> C.T.S. dépôt: 72, Victoria Street, S.W.1.

for a couple of years, committed a series of fearful massacres in Armenia, was beaten at immense cost of blood and treasure, and now dictates terms to his conquerors.

**The need  
of  
European Peace.**

In the clash of notes, peremptory, exculpatory, denunciatory, mediatory, between Germany and the Allies on the matter of reparations, the only questions that interest us here are: what are the prospects of peace to Christendom and how can the war-wounds of humanity be most speedily and effectively healed? Peace can never be secured through a rigid adherence to the Versailles Treaty, which is, on the whole, a vindictive instrument badly conceived, and in many respects needs amendment. That seems to be the common opinion outside French political circles. And the injuries of war cannot, manifestly, be remedied by a continuance of the war atmosphere, which does not allow feelings to subside or judgment to grow clear. The renewal of negotiations in lieu of a blind policy of force and resistance gives some gleam of hope, and nothing should be allowed to throw us back. For this question does not concern France and Germany alone, but Europe and the world as well. The prolongation of their quarrel affects a million interests outside their boundaries: the whole near East, imperfectly civilized as it is, is being further debauched by the spirit of militarism: no restoration, no progress is possible whilst this open sore is allowed to fester. Germany's offer to surrender the whole question of reparation to the judgment of a competent world tribunal, whilst paying a substantial sum "on account," is surely worth acceptance, for in the dispute as to her capacity, only expert financiers can arrive at a just decision. The League of Nations was originally set up to adjudicate on such questions, but the French politicians will have nothing to say to it. As for security and guarantees the world is too much interested in the proscription of future war not to make certain that these are adequate and permanent.

Meanwhile the distress in Germany continues, and presses most hardly on the young and helpless. Father Martindale, in his always interesting *Inter-University Magazine* (May), prints piteous details from various University centres of the destitution to which clergy and students are reduced by the chaotic state of German finance, and that, whatever its cause, cannot now be restored to order until peace is assured. The new generations are being deprived of necessary sustenance, both for body and mind, and the plight of those who depend on fixed incomes like most of the religious establishments, or on charitable donations, is really desperate. Let the reader imagine coinage here so devaluated that the purchasing power of £100 becomes that

of a penny, and he may realize how necessary a speedy peace has become in order to save civilization.

**The Revised  
Common  
Prayer Book.**

Both Houses in the Anglican National Assembly have now approved the permissive use of the Revised Book of Common Prayer, in face of a solemn appeal (*The Times*, April 20th)

by the ex-Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Knox, to the House of Laity to shelve the question for a year. The counter-appeal of the Bishop of St. Albans (*Times*, April 24th),

that the Church of England should to-day be true to its boasted tradition of comprehensiveness—which I personally believe in—but that if that comprehensiveness is to be maintained, it must be adjusted to existing conditions, and that the only limits of such comprehensiveness are the limits of the truth with its touch-stones of Scripture and tradition,

was more successful, and the Church of England retains her "boasted tradition of comprehensiveness." But that keen critic of Anglican pretensions, Bishop Hensley Henson, does not like comprehensiveness which tolerates "Anglo-Catholicism." "Who is to determine those limits?" he asks (*Times*, April 25th), adding, "After a careful study of Anglo-Catholic literature, I cannot find that they acknowledge any authority in the Church of England, certainly no such authority as the Church claimed and exercised at the Reformation as is explicitly formulated in her standards." Here we have the old appeal to the thirty-nine Articles, those ambiguous formularies. But the Bishop doesn't say who gave Cranmer and his associates authority to settle once and for all the doctrine and discipline of the Church which they set up. Nor does Prebendary Wace, writing on the same day, throw any further light on the question. He says the Bishop of St. Albans with "his touch-stones of Scripture and tradition" raises the whole controversy between the Churches of England and Rome. Formerly Anglo-Catholics limited tradition to the first six centuries: now they seem to accept the whole tradition of Rome. And he calls upon the Bishops to agree amongst themselves "upon these principles," before asking the clergy and laity to revise and recast their Prayer Book. These old fashioned Protestants, at any rate, know where they stand: they are not trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds: having discarded an infallible Teacher, they are content with a fallible one—the authority which the English Church "claimed and exercised" at the Reformation in the one case [where is it now, we wonder]; in the other a problematical agreement amongst the Bishops "on two or three principles." For who is to interpret

decisively the Anglican formularies, or who is to say whether the Bishops are right, even were they to agree? Without a living authority which cannot err, all religious bodies must fall into the state stigmatized by St. Paul (II. Tim., 3, 7) of "always learning and never arriving at knowledge of the truth."

"An  
alternative  
use."

As argued in another page of this issue, the formulation of an "alternative use" in the Anglican liturgy would be an official acknowledgment that the Establishment had no common faith, in which case, as one prelate acutely remarked, there might as well be an "alternative Bishop" in each diocese. But the Archbishop of Canterbury goes further and says equivalently, "If one alternative use, why not several?" And he pictures the devout churchman of the future visiting a strange church and bringing with him all possible "uses" in a wheelbarrow! Herein his Grace goes beyond Father Ronald Knox in humorous conjecture, for the latter, in his "Memories of the Future," does not contemplate more than five Anglican service books as having been finally authorized. The old Book of Common Prayer, the Abridged Book of Common Prayer, "the same with the tautologies cut out," the Book of Ancient and Modern Prayer, the Revised Book of Common Prayer, "a temporizing document which was highly recommended by all the Bishops and is, as far as I know, used nowhere," and the Book of Modern Prayer. To judge by the speeches and the correspondence which the question has aroused, this anticipation hardly seems exaggerated. Yet through it all one detects a readiness on the part of one "school of thought" to tolerate what it reckons heresy in another, provided its own views find expression. "We must all be prepared to countenance things in the Prayer Book of which we disapprove," is the Bishop of Peterborough's message to his diocese (*Times*, May 5th). "If not, we may as well bid farewell to peace in the Church, and still more, to any hope of reunion with other Churches." The Bishop's attitude is quite logical, assuming that he and his episcopal brethren have no authority to teach. *The Times* for May 4th, printed a leader on the whole subject, which is a masterpiece of verbal camouflage. One specimen must suffice. Speaking of the "order for communion" favoured by the Anglo-Catholics, it says, "it certainly accentuates elements of eucharistic doctrine and worship which the Church of England has hitherto refrained from emphasizing, even if it has not formally rejected them." How the Church of England at the Reformation "refrained from emphasizing" the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist may be read in the utterances of her prelates summarized in Dom Norbert Birt's *The Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth* (C.T.S.)



**The  
Fascisti and the  
Populars.**

All the world has been watching with intense interest the experiment in government which, since last October, the personality of Signor Mussolini, backed by the arms of his Fascisti, has forced upon Italy. The experiment on the whole has been a wonderful success. More has been accomplished in the way of internal reform than many years of Italian Parliamentary rule could effect. It may be even said that Italy is well governed for the first time since her attainment of national unity. But the very success attained makes one more anxious about its permanence. Signor Mussolini has not yet "regularized" his position. He has made no provision for the continuance of his reforms. Although by decree of the legislature, he has been confirmed in his dictatorship until the end of the summer, he cannot count, any more than any other mortal, on reaching the end of any given day, and that the less because, like all prominent men, he is a target for the assaults of the unbalanced or disaffected. Accordingly, it is a matter of some concern for those who wish Italy well that the quasi-support which the Popular Party, many of whose projected reforms the Fascisti have carried out, have hitherto given the dictator, should have been lately rejected by him, because at the Turin Congress it was somewhat qualified. That Congress determined to continue its collaboration with the present Government "as being the protector of moral and religious principles," but it reaffirmed its support of the principle of Proportional Representation which Signor Mussolini, it seems, has determined to abolish, in spite of a subsequent modification made by the Deputies of the Party. Hence these points of difference; the Prime Minister has practically dismissed the four members of the Party who were in his Ministry, and thus severed himself officially from an organization which could give stability to his rule. We can only hope that the dictator will come to see the wisdom of renewing his co-operation with those whose views in the main so coincide with his, and who can give him that constitutional support which he at present lacks.

**Alleged  
Intolerance in  
Catholic  
Spain.**

The relations between Church and State in Spain are so intimate that any dispute between the two is very apt to be misunderstood or exaggerated by the non-Catholic, especially if he is also an anti-Catholic. Spain at present has a "Liberal" Government bent on many much needed reforms in matters political and social. But, as one of the tenets of Continental "Liberalism" is separation between Church and State, the Government must needs put on its programme the reform of Article II. of the Constitution—that which secures to the Catholic Church her position as Church of the nation—with the view of giving other

cults a more or less equal status. Naturally the Church in Spain protests at any change which is not the outcome of agreement between the two parties to the Concordat which governs such matters, but that protest does not mean that she wishes to suppress conscientious religious liberty. Proselytism is another thing—that sort with which Ireland has long been familiar, the buying from poor and degraded parents of the bodies of little children so that they may be reared in hatred of the Catholic faith. The Church, in every land, has a right to invoke the aid of the State to prevent nefarious traffic of that kind.

**The Plight  
of  
Agriculture.**

When this country laid itself out to be chief of the industrial nations and to supply the world with all the mechanical conveniences of civilization it abandoned all attempt to be directly self-supporting. Its inhabitants became concentrated in the industrial towns, and the countryside was deserted. Food-stuffs were imported cheaply and plentifully from abroad in exchange for manufactures, and so long as things were normal the arrangement worked fairly well. But, as we found during the war, the land of England fell rapidly out of cultivation; the plight of agriculture became very grave; farming demanded more and more capital to make any profit. Landlords, farmers and labourers all alike felt the pinch. The recent strike in Norfolk has recalled public attention to this gravest of problems, and various schemes are being propounded to assist the recovery of agriculture. The root of the problem is the middleman who manages transport and retail, stands between the producer and the consumer, and takes his toll from both. If the middleman combines with others, then both producer and consumer are more at his mercy. He is an evil, but a necessary evil, in our complex civilization. How to get rid of the superfluous middleman, and how to control the middleman that is left—this problem must be solved before agriculture can recover. And the solution of the problem lies in the return to the legally-fixed "just price." We say "return," for it was only at the beginning of the nineteenth century that the idea was legally abandoned, and traders were allowed by law to make what they could by their trade. In the eighteenth century the law proclaimed that "All endeavours whatsoever to enhance the common price of merchandise, and all kinds of practices which have an apparent tendency thereto, are highly criminal." If that law still stood how busy our courts would be, for a time: there is hardly an article of commerce to-day that has not its price enhanced by some malpractice in manufacture or distribution. Agriculture suffers not the least: it is said that, owing to heavy transport charges and the manipulations of markets, at least

half the price paid by the consumer fails to reach the farmer. And he by a natural process tries to get cheap labour, so of the three who suffer the labourer is most to be pitied, for he is nearest to the border line of want. In the remedies proposed for regulating this industry, people who abhor the very name of Socialism are to be found advocating an amount of State interference that almost amounts to nationalization. In one issue of *The Times* (April 23rd) Lord Bledisloe and Lord Dunraven demand that agriculture shall be organized in the national interest and a more extended and more scientific control than that which obtained during the war be established. This, doubtless, joined to a tariff against foreign food, would do much to stimulate land cultivation at home. But of better augury—for we know what tariffs on food mean—is the scheme mooted last year at the Genoa economic conference for stabilising prices *internationally*, and thus obviating the need of tariffs and putting a salutary check on profiteering. When this has been done the world will have made a great stride towards international peace, and the land, which is the ultimate source of all wealth, and of the satisfaction of man's primary needs—food, clothing and shelter—will again become the chief factor in national prosperity.

**The Uniqueness  
of  
the Earth.**

As is well known the late Mr. A. R. Wallace, the friend of Darwin, and almost his equal in scientific attainment, abandoned agnosticism towards the close of his career and professed Christianity. It would seem that this lamentable lapse has done something to discredit him in the scientific world. Anyhow, a remarkable book which he published in 1903 has apparently dropped out of memory. That book was called *Man's Place in the Universe*, and in it Wallace devoted his vast store of learning to prove that instead of being, as it seems, an insignificant speck in the illimitable universe, the earth on which we live is really unique amongst all the myriads of stars and systems, as being the only globe capable of sustaining animal life. This is effected by the coincidence of a vast number of delicate arrangements and adjustments in our terrestrial surroundings, which combination—in matters of heat, atmosphere, water and its distribution, the seasons, gravitation, etc., etc.—is nowhere repeated in creation. The proposition is illustrated by a wealth of scientific lore and supported by cogent arguments, and the book makes fascinating reading. But it must have been lost sight of, or else why should a *Times* correspondent wax enthusiastic about a "brilliant Halley lecture" of Dr. J. H. Jeans, Secretary of the Royal Society, wherein that eminent man "moved with relentless logic to the conclusion that systems such as our own must be very rare in the starry universe," and, with-

out any mention of the conclusion reached by Wallace's relentless logic twenty years ago, advanced the cautious proposition "that it is just possible, although again quite improbable, that our earth may be the only body in the whole universe which is capable of supporting life." However others may ignore Wallace's valuable book, it should be kept in mind by the Catholic apologist, for it destroys the surface impression that our globe is, so to speak, an accident, a mere chance product of a minor sun, instead of being a miracle of subtle adaptation, to which the myriad mammoths of the universe minister in many ways, and which exhibits the foresight and skill of an Infinite Intelligence.

**More  
Pseudo-Science**

Mr. Vernon Kellogg, a writer who, though a materialist, has done valuable service to correct thought in the past by proclaiming the actual bankruptcy of Darwinism<sup>1</sup> as a key to the problem of origins, seems nevertheless unable to give up his godless creed, showing once more that credulity is proof against evidence and that strong desires generate prejudice.

For faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast

To some dear falsehood, hugs it to the last.

In a recent article published in the *New Republic* this writer says: "The series from Pithecanthropus to Homo Sapiens is being steadily revealed, with every promise of the early future filling in the remaining gaps"—a statement which would shock even the student of the *Outline of Science*. For that misleading record, at any rate, shows that none of the few fossil bones in our museums can be safely regarded as in the direct line of man's supposed ancestry, and there has been no certain addition to them: since the Piltdown discovery in 1908. The Rhodesian skull (1921) may be quite modern—it was found amongst modern bones and implements in a cave, the roof of which had fallen in—whilst the Nebraskan tooth to which Professor Osborn of New York, "after forty hours of careful study," gave the ridiculous name of "Hesperopithecus Harold-cookii," is said by calmer observers to belong to a bear. To this constant misreading and doctoring of the evidence are men driven who deliberately reject the idea of a First Cause. His dabbings in Spiritualism have long since deprived Sir Oliver Lodge of that trust which his great services to physical science naturally engendered, and it is without surprise that we find him ranging himself with the apriorists in his contribution to the *Outline of Science* (vol. II., p. 401). Notice the entire rejection of revelation in the following:—

In the long evolution of humanity we trace first the gradual emergence of the organic from the inorganic, the

<sup>1</sup> *Darwinism To-day* (New York, 1908).

utilization of highly complex chemical compounds for the formation and purposes of life, and then the gradual rise of living things in the scale of existence, until at a certain stage the rudiments of mind and consciousness begin to make their appearance. At some unknown time after this must have arisen the power of choice and knowledge of good and evil, which may be regarded as the most definitely human characteristic. Then, humanity, too, went on rising in the scale until it blossomed and bore fruit in the creations of art, the discoveries of science and in works of genius.

Another eminent naturalist, Sir Ray Lankester, in the same work (611), speaking of "abiogenesis" says [*italics ours*], "It is now held that, *though in the remote past this must have occurred*, there is no evidence to show that it takes place at the present day." Why do these distinguished men, so logical in their general mental processes, continually assert that the effect can transcend the cause, that, contrary to the wise proverb, "you *can* get more out of a sack than there is in it," except that they desire to escape from the conception of a divine self-existent First Cause?

**The Tyranny  
of  
Prohibition.**

Unable to prevent the sale of liquor in their own territory, the Government of the United States, acting on a decision of their Supreme Court and by a singular and unprecedented stretch of prerogative, intend to make the attempt on the territory of other nations. For that is the plain English of the declaration, that by virtue of the tyrannous Prohibition law no foreign vessels can enter American ports with strong drink on board, even though it be sealed against consumption. It would seem that the judges who gave this decision are aiming at bringing the Eighteenth Amendment into still further disrepute with a view to its repeal, for a more intolerable and unnecessary invasion of national rights can hardly be imagined. To counteract it, an English member of Parliament has introduced a bill to compel all vessels entering British waters to carry a certain minimum of liquor for passengers and crew. The bill will probably never be discussed, and in any case, will hardly be effective, for the same Supreme Court with supreme disregard for consistency has declared that outside their own waters American ships may carry and use as much strong drink as they chose!

Testimonies vary as to the success of the Prohibition amendment in effecting its purpose, but all witnesses agree that its enactment has proved demoralizing to a degree. Catholic moral theology regards it as an unjust infringement of human liberty,

and considers that no moral obligation arises to observe it *vi legis*, although to obviate the scandal of an open defiance of law, and because no rights of conscience are involved, men are counselled to obey it. But no obligation of any sort attaches to the new Supreme Court decision and we trust that all sovereign nations will combine to ignore it. This our contemporary *America* thinks will be the case, with the result that:

The diplomats will file their protests, the Federal Government will then turn one drooping and one blind eye upon these foreign ships, and we shall have one more instance of contempt of law, but this time with a difference: the contempt of a Government for its own law and for its own Supreme Court.

Meanwhile the civilized world will mark with astonishment the growth, in what is supposed to be the country of freedom, of State tyranny and intolerance. These instances of interference give additional point to Opal, Lady Porstock's cynical allusion to the Statue of Liberty, which at the time of her arrival in America "had only just been fitted with the apparatus which makes its right eye wink on the approach of the traveller."<sup>1</sup>

**Blessed Robert Bellarmine and Thomas Jefferson** The occasion of the Beatification of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine has reminded some of our Transatlantic friends of his services to the cause of democracy. In the May issue of the *Catholic World* an interesting disclosure is made of the fact that in Thomas Jefferson's copy of *Patriarcha*, a work in defence of the "divine right of kings," written against Bellarmine and quoting largely from his writings, many doctrines of the newly Beatified are underlined, which embody the spirit and almost anticipate the phraseology of the famous Declaration of Independence. That the early Jesuit theologians in their opposition to State tyranny did much to lay the foundations of modern democracy has long been recognized,<sup>2</sup> and has lately been developed in detail by Professor O'Rahilly in *Studies*, but never has the influence of their teachings on the founders of the American constitution been so clearly pointed out. Properly grateful to Blessed Robert, our contemporary suggests that "We Americans ought to adopt him as our own particular saint and patron."<sup>3</sup>

THE EDITOR.

<sup>1</sup> *Memories of the Future*: c. vii., "What I found in America."

<sup>2</sup> See *THE MONTH*, April, 1918, p. 364.

<sup>3</sup> The interesting account of the life and works of the Blessed Cardinal which recently appeared in *THE MONTH* is now printed as a twopenny C.T.S. pamphlet.



## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Genesis**, Chap. II., Historical Value of [H. Schumacher in *Homiletic Review*, March, April, May, 1923].

**Lying**, The Ethics of [J. H. Fisher in *America*, May 12, 1923, p. 78].

**Temptations of Christ**: their object [Rev. P. Boylan in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May, 1923, p. 449].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

"**Anglo-Catholic**" Make-Believe [E. Lester, S.J., in *Tablet*, May 12, 1923, p. 633].

**Book of Common Prayer** heretical, The [C. Tigar, S.J., in *Month*, June, 1923, p. 481].

**Christ and Pagan Gods** [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Messenger of the S.H.*, June, 1923, p. 172].

**Inge, Dean**, on Catholic Persecution, answered [Canon Barry in *Catholic Times*, May 5, 1923, p. 9].

**Proselytism in Ireland**, Historical View [Rev. E. J. Quigley in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May, 1923, p. 513].

**Pseudo-Science**, The Plague of [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, Jan., 1923, p. 526].

**Renan Centenary**: Effect in France [*Documentation Catholique*, April 21, p. 963].

**Stutfield's**, Mr., Calumnies against the Church refuted [O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.S.S.R., in *Catholic Truth*, May, 1923, p. 73, in *Universe*, May 11, 25, pp. 8 and 9].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Catholic Action in Italy**, Valuable Survey of [L. J. S. Wood in *Dublin Review*, April, 1923, p. 161].

**Catholicism in Russia** [*Catholic World*, May 1923, p. 247].

**Eastern Churches and Rites**: Statistics [R. P. Janin in *Documentation Catholique*, April 7, 1923, p. 875].

**France**, Depopulation of, through Birth-Control [D. Gwynn in *Blackfriars*, May, 1923, p. 806].

**Lincoln and the Catholic Church**, A. [*Brooklyn Tablet*, quoted in *Introibo*, March—April, 1923, p. 42].

**Oil Trusts**, The: how they dominate international politics [J. Berteloot in *Etudes*, May 5, 1923, p. 309].

**Priests' Housekeepers**, Association of, in U.S.A. [Fr. Thuente, O.P. in *Homiletic Review*, May, 1923, p. 822].

**Russia**, The Persecution in [*Catholic World*, May, 1923, p. 221].

**Temporal Power**, The: how the question stands [Y. De la Brière in *Etudes*, May 5, 1923, p. 352].

**United States**, Catholic Progress in [T. F. Coakley in *America*, April 21, 1923, p. 13: *Catholic World*, May 1923, p. 250].

**Vatican Council**: Prospects of its renewal [J. C. Reville in *America*, May 5, 1923, p. 53].

**Zionism**, Present State of the question [*Nouvelles Religieuses*, Feb. 1, 1923].

# REVIEWS

I—MARK<sup>1</sup>

MR. CHURCHILL, in his otherwise penetrating appreciation of the subject of this memoir, surmises that, because of the remarkable flowering of his early promise, "if he had lived he would in all probability have reached the Cabinet." Only Mr. Belloc who wrote of "Lord Lundy" could comment adequately on such an anti-climax, conceived as the culmination of a great career. There are greater titles to fame, though the mere politician may not think so, than a seat in the Cabinet; there are many who reach the Cabinet without being in any way famous. Yet Mark Sykes would doubtless have become a Minister in time, but hardly in any party Government. By birth he was a Tory, a man of wealth and position, a great landowner, but all his life through he fought, instinctively as it were, against the cramping traditions of his class. There was enough to absorb the average man in the management of a famous stud and a large estate and the manifold occupations of a prominent country squire; there was the possibility of a life of mere pleasure which assured wealth puts within reach, and no lack of precedent for following it. But this strong and independent character disdained inglorious ease, and used the opportunities that were his by fortune only to tread unbeaten tracks of travel with both body and mind. Of him it might emphatically have been said—*Qui potuit transgredi et non est transgressus*.

Few boys can have had so singular an upbringing: we gather something of the eccentricities of his parents from the biographer's hints and from their recorded treatment of their son, but so sketchily are they presented that we are not even told when either of them died. His father took Mark in his school-days far and wide over the face of the world: with his mother, but before he could choose for himself, he made "the journey to Rome," which was to mean

<sup>1</sup> *Mark Sykes: his Life and Letters*. By Shane Leslie, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill. London: Cassell and Co. Pp. viii. 308. Price, 16s. net.

so much in his after life. If his father made him a great traveller and explorer, he owed more to this action of his mother's, which put him in the way of being a great Catholic. His actual schooling was so short and so spasmodic that nothing but his natural goodness and the grace of the Sacraments can have prevented him from growing up spoiled and selfish. But, although sojourning for long months in Churchless lands and consorting both at home and abroad with all manner of misbeliefs and unbeliefs, nothing seems to have dimmed the brightness of his faith or impaired the fidelity of his service. And his happy marriage with a like-minded Catholic served naturally to stimulate both.

Mark Sykes had already made a name as an explorer of Hither Asia when the Boer War broke out. On that prolonged and somewhat inglorious campaign his letters provide a sardonic commentary. His cartoons, with which the book is plentifully and agreeably sprinkled, show that he was under no illusion as to the inner forces at work there: indeed, his sketches of the ubiquitous Jew would have delighted the late lamented *New Witness*. Yet he subsequently became one of the chief promoters of that ill-advised attempt to restore the Jews to Palestine—a project which before the end caused him grave misgivings; just as his early championship of the Turk was changed by fuller experience into opposition. He renewed his acquaintance with the East after the war, entered Parliament for Hull in 1911, and retained the seat till his death. In the House and on the platform his broad common-sense views, both of home and foreign politics, gained him the press-title of "M.P. for England." He was never afraid to vindicate his faith from slander, and once made a notable defence of the Irish priesthood against a characteristic attack in the *Morning Post*.

The Great War found him with an assured position as a Parliamentary force, and, in his case, as in that of many others, hastened his political growth. Although he was all for serving with his Yorkshire battalion, his unique knowledge of Turkey, Arabia and Egypt made Lord Kitchener employ him on General Service. His time was spent on important missions, one of which resulted in the Sykes-Picot Agreement, and acting as *liaison* officer for Middle East affairs between the various departments. His ceaseless journeys and the intense strain of such responsibility wore

him out, and he had no strength to resist the influenza which attacked him in Paris whilst the Peace Conference was sitting.

To one who knew Mark as a little round-faced boy at school, when his chief apparent qualities were, to the outside observer, good humour and a unique mimetic talent, his career in the great world was a wonderful revelation. As far as secular learning goes, he was self-educated, with the world's "cities and men" as his university and tutors. But religion found space for sound development in the soil of his upright heart, and remained the chief interest in his life. Doubtless, in these tedious days of "reconstruction," he would have taken, had he lived, the high place that was his by talent and devotion in the Catholic life of this land. His were all the qualities that made for leadership—enthusiasm, sound principle, attractiveness, and the eloquence that comes from fearlessness and sincerity. Before the war he was too much immersed in exploration and politics to identify himself directly with the Catholic cause: he spoke, it is true, at the First National Catholic Congress at Leeds in 1910, and, we think, at Norwich two years later; but he was then comparatively unknown, and the war, which so fully developed his noble character, claimed him in his maturity as its victim.

Mr. Leslie has made the man live before us: the book is a brilliant impressionist sketch, neglecting no aspect of its subject and drawing largely on his letters. Whilst deepening our sense of our loss in Sir Mark, it affords at the same time a lasting example and inspiration to all his co-religionists in this country. A few sentences from his last election address, sent home from Jerusalem in November, 1918, form a stern rebuke to all militarists and self-seekers:

Since the commencement of the war I have known no party. I stand for a League of Nations, disarmament and the abolishment of war. In the peace terms I stand neither for aggrandisement nor revenge, but for justice, reparation and security. During the war I have accepted neither honour nor office.

A truly Christian ideal unselfishly pursued.

2—ISRAEL UNDER THE JUDGES<sup>1</sup>

**T**HIS interesting volume deals with the period from the conquest of Palestine (exclusive, except for a short summary) to the judgeship of Samuel. It appears from p. xv. that it will be followed by one on the early kings—and so, presumably, by at least one other on the later kings. The author remarks that for the age of the Judges this is one of the fullest histories yet published. For the period to be covered by the complete work it will be, we think, the first well developed History of Israel written by a Catholic.

Besides the six chapters on the narratives there are three on agriculture, society, manners and civilization (the really very important questions connected with the origin of the iron-age in Palestine, though not neglected, seem scarcely to be adequately faced); and four chapters on religion, Canaanite and Israelite. The appreciation of the "religious ideas" of the Canaanite religion, in fact, of its *idea*—the divinity of Life—is an elegant little essay in rational synthesis which has the same sort of fascination as Ramsay's evocations of the soul of Anatolia.

Two chapters deal with the Philistines and (briefly) other peoples of Southern Syria. In the former, the remoter background supposed is, perhaps, too slightly presented: not enough to justify the implicit assumption (p. 62) that people from [Late III Minoan] Crete-Lycia would have spoken any sort of Greek. A propos of the Philistines, a note on Dagon, p. 205, would derive him from "Chaldæa": Assyriologists will scarcely agree; and the notion that the Babylonian Dagan was probably a heaven-god implies perhaps a misunderstanding of the evidence. Better, he was a West-Semitic god, adopted in Babylonia, and equated to En-lil (as approximating to the Baal-type?). May one be permitted to regret the absence of a section on the Hittites, now attracting general attention again? Hrozný's recent researches in the apparently Indo-European language of the Boghaz-Kyöi tablets raises the question whether barons of "Aryan" descent may not have contributed to the aristocratic

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire du peuple hébreu, des Juges à la captivité*. Tome I. La période des Juges. 3<sup>e</sup> mille. By L. Desnoyers, professeur à la faculté de théologie de l'Institut Catholique de Toulouse. Paris: Desclée, de Brouwer et Cie. Pp. xvi. 431. 2 Maps. 1922.

stock of Palestine. Professor Desnoyers duly notices the possibility that Shamgar and Sisera are Hittite names, but not that Abd(?)-Hiba, King of Jerusalem in the fourteenth century, bears the name of a Hittite divinity. How interesting is the bare possibility of a strain of Aryan blood in the governing classes of Jerusalem, then and afterwards! But this perhaps will be a topic in the next volume, when the solution of the Boghaz-Kyöi problem may have advanced somewhat.

In an appendix on chronology, Professor Desnoyers inclines to the earlier date for the exodus (Tell el-Amarna period). There are two folding maps: one to illustrate the Philistine migration (*Alasya*, without a query, *Chypre*); one of Palestine, showing the [modern] routes. Identifications in Palestinian topography seem well up to date; but it may be useful to remark that, like so many other authors, M. Desnoyers neglects to make his identifications consistent in view of I Sam. vii. 16 (Ramah, Bethel, Gilgal, Mispah, should probably form a circuit). Gabaa de Dieu (Ramallah) is omitted on the map.

In the footnotes there may be a number of useful details which are new, and which we should like to mention; but which precisely are new is not easily discoverable, as M. Desnoyers has dispensed himself (p. xvi.), perhaps rather freely, from precise bibliographical indications. Thus, one supposed at first that the attractive identification (p. 62<sup>1</sup>) of kaphtor=capital (in architecture) with Kaphtor=Crete (as in our use of place-names for objects of art, *e.g.*, damask, Sèvres) was a suggestion of the author's: but cf. René Dus-saud's *Les civilisations préhelléniques*: p. 299. (The honours of another philological curiosity,—Berber *azzel* (iron)=*barzel*,—do not belong to Gsell (see the reference) as p. 67<sup>2</sup> seems to imply.)

Catholic Biblicists will be principally interested in the position adopted in the main problems of criticism. In documentary analysis a new system is sketched (381—406). There were, relevantly to this period, three main literary currents: "Levitic," issuing from Moses; pre-prophetic, also born at the time of Moses; prophetic, connected with the preceding. Each of these currents is represented, though unequally, in the literatures of North and South. Dates proposed are: pre-prophetic—under the Judges or to a little after the secession; prophetic—late 10th or 9th centuries;



Levitic—partly under the Judges, partly under David or a little after. The hypothesis of Levitic historiography at this time is the most original contribution to the question: North Levitic are I Sam. iv. (also xiii., xiv. 1); South Levitic, Jud. xvii., xviii.; xix.—xxi. (partly rehandled by P, which also would represent a "current"); I Sam. v., vi. (A special Ark-document in I Sam. iv.—vi. has also been proposed by A. R. S. Kennedy, *Century Bible*, perhaps unknown to M. Desnoyers.) The system cannot be judged without a minute study of the historical books (and the Pentateuch) than was within the scope of the present volume: the author, indeed, seems to promise (p. xv.) a fuller justification (in a subsequent volume of this work?). Meanwhile we remain interested but unconvinced.

Though a friend to documentary analysis, Professor Desnoyers is cautious in historical criticism. Material contributed from later sources is not neglected in the historical synthesis, though allowance is often to be made (p. 402) for generalization and "grossissement" (notably in figures). In general, the documentary system proposed makes for confidence in the narratives: instead of a series of sources decreasing in authority as in antiquity, we have contemporary currents—popular and prophetic parallel to clerical—representing not so much stages of temporal development as differing interests.

One almost fears to summarize the author's careful discussions of the development of the religion, but these are too interesting to be quite passed over. At first there was relatively pure Yahwehism, with occasional pure idolatry: then Yahwehism was, partially, and not very rapidly, Baalized. The hybrid religion is less evident under the Judges than under the Kings (pp. 275-7 are good.) As to the neglect of Pentateuchal laws, a very simple, yet perhaps new, point is made. Law would be studied and elaborated in higher sacerdotal circles, somewhat aloof from real life: it would be little known to the common priests, still less to the people. Now the written history of this period is largely of prophetic origin. But the prophets were not men of the law. . . . If the histories had been written by canonists, these would have criticized the facts from their own point of view, in the manner of P: but for the period of *Judges* there are relatively few fragments from P (315-323). The Deuteronomic law of centralization is a faithful expression

of the mind of Moses. The Ark should have centralized religion (323—333). Another element of uniformity was the inter-tribal Levitic corps. The author attaches great importance to this body, which was a true hereditary tribe, related to Moses by its origin, and so possessed of considerable prestige, and the natural protagonist of Yahwehism and of the institute of their founder. To this body was reserved the custody of the Ark, and the oracle of Ephod and Lots. Sacrifice was not yet in practice reserved, though priesthood would be (as it were) delegated by preference to a Levite when the head of a family required a chaplain: also as guardians of the sanctuary, Levites were naturally interested in sacrifice; in the end pre-eminently so. Meanwhile their oracle paled before that of the prophets, and the Ephod survived only as an ornament (120 ff., 301-6, 333-9).

A work which grapples (up to a certain point) with such matters as these, and which brings to the investigation a wealth of sound scholarship, will certainly interest all who occupy themselves with the Biblical Question.

## SHORT NOTICES.

### BIBLICAL.

FATHER Hugh Pope's *Aids to the Bible*, of which the third volume dealing with Acts, Epistles and Apocalypse has lately appeared (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, pp. xiv., 461; 7s.6d. n.), are already recognized as amongst the most useful items in the list of our Catholic biblical literature; hence the completion of the work will be generally welcome. Like the second volume, it would perhaps best be described simply as an "introduction"; the first volume, dealing mainly with the Old Testament, was more specifically of the nature of "Aids," but hardly the New Testament volumes. Taking the present volume, therefore, to be an introduction, we may say that it will be found both sane and practical. The author has done his work conscientiously, especially in what regards the Fathers and early writers. We could have wished that he had been at equal pains to introduce his readers to contemporary Catholic work, not a little of which is conspicuous by its absence; to non-Catholic work, on the other hand, he appears to us to be too generous, as when, for example, he speaks of "reliable authors" in the *International Critical Commentary* (p. 73). He finds the "South Galatian" theory more acceptable (p. 145), but disappoints us by ending a discussion of the hierarchy in apostolic times with a note of interrogation (p. 227). We cannot say that we find this discussion very satisfactory, and the Appendix in the Westminster Version remains to our thinking the best treatment of the subject in English. Cardinal Cajetan, on the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (p. 264), is positively startling. The discussion of the Heavenly

Witnesses reserves the vital point for the very last sentence, namely, the meaning of the word "authentic" as used by Holy Office (p. 331). We should have liked to see the very important and difficult question of St. Jude's use of the Apocrypha treated thoroughly. These and some other points have struck us in perusal, but do not detract from the general value of the work for students.

#### CANON LAW.

Of three works published by P. Marietti, Turin—*De Synodo Diocesana*, by Can. Doct. Marius Pistocchi (3.75 l.); *De Casuum Conscientiae Reservationem*, by P. Nicolaus Farrugia (3.50 l.); *De Locis et Temporibus Sacris*, by P. Matthaeus A. Coronata, O.M.C. (14 l.)—the first is a brief commentary on canons 356—362 of the Code, dealing with the holding of a diocesan synod. The brochure adds little to what the canons themselves tell us, and it seems strange to ask such a price for fifty pages of fairly large print. The second treats of the whole subject of Reservation. It is a second edition of a work published before the Code, and, in spite of copious references to the Code, we think the author's treatment of the subject is somewhat out of harmony with the canons which deal with the reservation of *sins*. He states quite clearly that reservation of sins affects primarily the confessor, but in the many cases he discusses he seems obsessed with the notion that the penitent "incurs" a reserved sin in the same way as he incurs a reserved censure. Hence his treatment of "peregrini," "impuberes," "ignorantia reservationis" leaves something to be desired. Similarly, when dealing explicitly with the reservation of sins he constantly appeals to canons which deal with reservation of censures. There is much, however, in the pamphlet which will repay careful study. In the third and larger volume Father M. A. Coronata provides us with an excellent, detailed treatment of the matter contained in the second part of the third book of the Code. As the author tells us in his modest preface, it is the outcome of lectures to theological students, whose difficulties are discussed fully and met with a wealth of learning which testifies to the author's competence to deal with his subject. The notion and history of churches, basilicas, oratories, and altars; the laws dealing with cremation, cemeteries, funerals, the denial of Christian burial; feast days, fasting and abstinence—all receive careful and systematic exposition. It is not a commentary on the Code, but an index of the canons dealt with in the course of the work enables the reader to use it as such.

#### DEVOTIONAL.

Last year Père Janvier, O.P., preached for the twentieth successive time the celebrated Lenten Conferences at N. D. de Paris—surely a record to be proud of and thankful for. The subject of his discourses was the virtue of temperance, already begun in the preceding Lent and now brought to an end. The resulting volume, *La Vertu de Tempérance*, II. (Lethielleux: 8.00 fr.), dealing expressly with meekness, humility, and modesty, contains a surprising amount of sound and useful teaching, adapted to the circumstances of our time and illustrated by its events.

Our Lord is the Model for all teachers, especially where religious instruction is concerned. The best method will be that which approaches nearest to His. He used no catechism, nor words that required an explanatory manual. His speech was of the simplest. More often than

not he conveyed His teaching in the form of stories. Story-telling in religious instruction is an art, then, which He Himself has sanctified, and one can safely say that the neglect of that art is one cause of the blight that is apt to fall on our religious instruction. The *Sower* is leading the way here as elsewhere, doing all it can to get the art of story-telling restored to its proper place. *Stories in School*, published anonymously, has a Preface in which Father Drinkwater, the editor of the *Sower*, pleads for the general adoption of stories in the religious curriculum. The book contains references to Old and New Testament stories, together with outlines of about fifty saints' lives, sufficient in all for a four years' course. Most wisely the writer gives the outlines of the stories only, so that the teacher can assimilate these and reproduce them in a personal way: the only way that carries conviction. The volume is well got up and is more reasonable in price (5s.) than some of the productions of Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. The occasionally erratic use of dark type, *e.g.*, on pp. 26, 27, 83, puzzles the reader.

The *Little Ones* is yet another *Sower* handbook (Sands, London: 2s. 6d. net), having for its sub-title "Teachers' Notes for Three Years." They are as a rule not teachers' notes but the lessons in full, and the matter provided would not be sufficient for anything like three years. But it is an excellent book, the best one yet on the religious instruction of the tiniest ones. What there is is so good that one only wishes there were more, and that the space used in giving complete lessons had been used for giving outline notes of more lessons. One hears and reads often that "such and such a book" ought to be in every school. That can with perfect truth be said of these two volumes. One would go further and say that every parish priest, on whom ultimately the responsibility for the religious instruction falls, should buy these books for his school and see that they are used. One envies the little ones in the Archdiocese of Birmingham who are taught by such methods as these what God is, and thinks with regret of their thousands of little brothers and sisters who in all corners of England are still being asked what God is, and who are giving an answer that they would understand equally well in the Latin tongue.

#### BIOGRAPHY.

It is not common to come across the story of the conversion of a French Protestant, so comparatively few are they and so remote in their Calvinism from the Faith. However, in *De l'Ombre à la Lumière* (Lethielleux: 6.00 fr.), "Marie-Thérèse" tells at some length how she was gradually rescued from error, first by the externals of the Catholic Church, the worship expressed in stone and liturgy, and then by an acquaintance with her doctrines and especially by a sense of the Real Presence. Hers was a long and hesitating pilgrimage, which lasted some seven years and the record of which will edify all readers and perhaps conduct others towards the Light.

*In Our Lady's Library* (Longmans: 4s. 6d. net), is the ingenious title which Miss Judith Smith has given to her character studies of women of the old Testament. The happy thought has occurred to her that the Books of the Old Testament must have formed the Library

of the Blessed Virgin, and that meditation on the characters of the women there depicted would have contributed to the formation of Our Lady's character. This conception in itself would have been enough to infuse fresh interest into the Biblical stories, but the author, by dint of a modern and unaffected style, as well as by her acute deduction and fine psychological insight, has contrived to give a peculiar freshness to the score or more characters included in her sketches. Each contains its own moral for the reader, and suggests a comparison with the perfected Woman, whose glories are summed up on the final pages under the title of "Mother of All." The little reflections on what may have been Our Lady's own thoughts as she read each story are a very happy method of pointing the moral. It is certainly useful to be able to "remember Lot's wife" as one who became "a monument of wilful failure." Much solid Biblical research, as well as an intuitive faculty for filling in details, has gone to the making of a book which should have a definite use in encouraging the study of the fine Old Testament types.

#### POETRY.

**A Priest's Prayer** is the title of the first poem in Father Allan Ross's little collection recently published (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.) Many of the others might come under the same title, and "A priest's thoughts" would have covered the whole, for all are the output of a mind working in the presence of God. Thoughts really inspired by religion are in themselves creative, the embodiment of spiritual beauty and truth, and so long as the religious verse-maker observes the canons of his art the result must needs be poetical. Father Allan Ross aims at simplicity, and he is most successful, most critics will agree, where he achieves simplicity—no light achievement—as in the lines, "St. Philip's heart," or those comparing a kitten's delight in a human caress to the soul touched by the finger of God. But the description of a garden on page 53 is a word-picture full of vivid hues, which some may think shows the poet at his best. The Sonnets on the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary are less satisfactory because of their departure from the normal form. The title poem contains one of the most haunting of the many devout reflections contained in the fifty or more poems which form the collection, and exhibit much facility of utterance, if no great originality of expression.

Another priestly author, not altogether unknown to our readers, has collected his poems from **THE MONTH** and elsewhere into a pleasing volume called **The City of the Grail and Other Verses** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.), to which Mr. Armel O'Connor has written an appreciative Preface. Father Henry Rope's muse is inspired by nature, music and art: his poems are Wordsworthian "poems of reflection," which disclose the inner meaning of places and events, seen *sub specie æternitatis*. A keen sense of the world's folly in deserting the worship of God for the cult of Mammon, whereby, seeking to save its life, it loses the same, gives poignancy to many of these thoughtful poems.

#### FICTION.

Our first book under this heading might equally well, or better, be classed under "Devotional." It is a book of which readers of **THE**

MONTH have from time to time been granted a foretaste, a book concerning the adventures, spiritual and earthly, of a group of Boy Scouts, numbering amongst them a certain green-eyed, red-haired urchin, called "Wops." A selection of those adventures has been gathered into a book and named **Beardless Counsellors** (Sands: 7s. 6d. net), by the author, Miss Cecily Hallack, a book, so full of varied enjoyment that one is loth to leave it down and eager to take it up again. A great gift of vivid description, especially a sense of colour, humour flashing softly like summer lightning, a competent knowledge of music and art, crisp and witty dialogue—these are the least of the attractions of these remarkable sketches, and they are used only as the vehicle to convey, with wonderful skill and persuasiveness, the one, true, Christian meaning of life. It may be the author's first book, but it shows a maturity and soundness of thought, as well as a mastery of expression, that would not disgrace a wrinkled sage, steeped in the only lore that matters, the understanding of the object of existence and how it should be attained. That is why we have suggested that the volume, for all its wit and sparkle, is really a spiritual treatise. Whilst showing how the underlying reality of Catholicism made itself felt in various minds, it gives Catholics themselves a better appreciation of the inexhaustible richness and romance of their faith. We should like all school libraries and all teachers of the young to get speedy possession of this exceptionally useful and pleasing volume. And we may surely hope that the author be inspired to put her plentiful talent to further usance to God's greater glory and our profit.

Often has folly been shot at as it flies, but until the advent of Father Ronald Knox's **Memories of the Future** (Methuen: 7s. 6d. net), never have present follies been effectively winged by the shrewd device of transfixing with the barb of satire their logical developments. For this purpose the satirist has had to transport himself half a century or more ahead and then write reminiscences of the period before that date. His imaginary diarist is "Opal, Lady Porstock," consequently the whole is viewed from the standpoint of a feminism so advanced as almost to reverse the present relations between the sexes. Her education, her travels, her illnesses and their treatment, her adventures in U.S.A., where she found her husband, the characteristics of society in her time, her Parliamentary experience, her contemporaries, and the state of England before the great war of 1972—a war which, on account of the perfection of weapons both of defence and offence, was conducted mainly by propaganda!—these form the substance of her whimsical memories and the vehicle of her editor's kindly but shrewd satire. It is hard to select passages for special praise when almost every sentence contains a chuckle, but perhaps the gem of the book is the sermon of Bishop Dives, the "relativist," on the intellectual value of Christianity, which rings the changes on "thinkage" and "thoughtage," "thinkable" and "think-worthy" and "thinkworthiness," with an appearance of profundity that out-Hibberts the *Hibbert*, and the further letter of elucidation which notes the successive rejection of Tradition, the Bible, and Reason, as being the triumph of "modern" thought. Here satire passes into deadly truth, the more effective for being uttered with a laugh. From the religious aspect the book is valuable polemic, and under every aspect it is a feast of fun.



## MISCELLANEOUS.

One had almost thought there was nothing more to be written about Lourdes—that unending source of fascination to all Catholics, and many non-Catholics too—yet Miss Edith Cowell has achieved that which many larger works have failed to do, for she has taken us there. **Up and Down Lourdes** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d. net) is impressionist rather than photographic, but it gains in reality rather than loses by this. It is the story of the author's two months' stay at the "Asile Notre Dame," working amongst the various pilgrim-patients—a story told with charm, great sincerity, and a fine sense of humour, which never for a moment hides the intense underlying pathos. As to style, there is sometimes an abrupt and unnecessary change from past to present tense which, whilst not adding to the liveliness of the narrative, irritates the reader and breaks the spell. Another little grievance is that the author doesn't give all her space to Lourdes, but wastes some on amusing but irrelevant details, for Lourdes is the subject which holds us enthralled, and we frankly grudge one page of the book to any other. Still, all lovers of Our Lady will welcome it, for the pilgrimage spirit is beautifully portrayed, and stress is properly laid on the honour thus done to God's Mother rather than on the cures, as is sometimes the case; the cures are not, though even Catholics are apt to think so, the principal thing. And non-Catholics also will appreciate it too, for it points out (as many other books have failed to do) that Our Lady, like Our Lord, wraps the whole world in the mantle of her love, and dispenses her favours to those also who through no fault of their own are not within the shelter of the Fold.

It is a welcome sign of the flourishing condition of the Catholic Church in America that it is able to turn the eyes of students from the issues of practical life to more recondite studies. For it must be a matter of some difficulty, amongst a people to whom classical studies do not greatly appeal—if one may trust general impressions—to foster the growth of the classical tradition, even in Catholic surroundings. It is, therefore, with great pleasure that we hail **St. Basil and Greek Literature** (Catholic University of America, Washington), by Leo V. Jacks, A.M., which is the forerunner, we may hope, of many useful volumes of Patristic studies proceeding from the same source. The purpose and contents of the book is best explained by quoting the opening words of the Introduction: "The object of this dissertation is to investigate Basil's knowledge of Greek literature, and to acquire, as far as possible, an insight into his attitude towards it. It is to be hoped that this object will be attained by collecting all direct quotations . . . and ideas which may . . . be attributed to the Greek civilization before him." To this end the author has, with great industry hunted up all the references in St. Basil's writings to the pagan writers, a task which must have involved very careful reading and a thorough knowledge of the classics. Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that in which the author traces the influence of the rhetoricians on St. Basil's style.

It is to be hoped that this series of studies will rapidly grow; there are many problems of theological and historical interest awaiting the patient research of students, and it is only by the production of Patristic monographs that these problems can be solved.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

AMERICA PRESS, New York.

*The Unending Sacrifice.* By J. C. Reville, S.J. Pp. 32. Price, 10c.

BENZIGER BROS., New York.

*Reardon Rah!* By R. E. Holland, S.J. Pp. 211. Price, \$1.25.  
*Ever Timely Thoughts.* By E. F. Garesché, S.J. Pp. 189. Price, \$1.25.

BEYAERT, Bruges.

*Principes d'Economie Sociale.* By V. Fallon, S.J. 2nd edit. Pp. 430. Price, 13.00 fr.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.

*The Economic Effects of the Reformation.* By George O'Brien. Pp. x. 194. Price, 7s. 6d.  
*Belief and Freedom.* By Bernard Holland. Pp. 186. Price, 5s.  
*A Knight in Palestine.* By A. O'Connor. Pp. xi. 100. Price, 3s.  
*The City of the Grail.* By H. E. G. Rope. Pp. viii. 64. Price, 3s. 6d.  
*Register of Mass Intentions.* Price, 1s. 6d.  
*Register of Sick Calls.* Price, 4s.  
*Church Notice Book.* Price, 4s.

CASSELL & Co., London.

*Mark Sykes: His Life and Letters.* By Shane Leslie. Pp. viii. 308. Price, 16s. net.

CATHOLIC ORPHAN PRESS, Calcutta.

*From Evangelical to Catholic.* By W. Wallace, S.J. Pp. 190.

HERDER, London.

*Thy Love and Thy Grace.* By C. Lattey, S.J. Pp. 306. Price, 6s. 2.  
*Thirteen Articles on Freemasonry.* By E. R. Hull, S.J. Pp. 144. Price, 12 annas.

H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE, London.

*British and Foreign State Papers, 1920.* Vol. CXIII. Pp. lxi. Price, 41s.  
*Calendar of Close Rolls.* Vol. IV. Pp. 788. Price, 40s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, London.

*The Divinity of Christ.* By J. Herbert Williams. Pp. x. 173. Price, 5s. net.

LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris.

*Conseils aux Aînés de mon Patronage.* By A. Michelin. Pp. 184. Price, 1.50 fr.  
*La Perte de Jérusalem.* By M. de Montpeyroux. Pp. 210.

Price, 2.00 fr. *Le Secret du dactylo.* By Abel Sibès. Pp. 272. Price, 2.00 fr. *Several Pamphlets.*

LETHIENLEUX, Paris.

*Les Idées pédagogiques de Dom Bosco.* By L. Breckx. Pp. 86. Price, 1.50 fr.  
*La Philosophie Moderne.* By Gaston Sortais, S.J. Tom. II. Pp. xi. 584.  
*La Devotion au Sacré-Cœur dans l'Ordre de S. Benoît.* By Dom U. Berlière. Pp. viii. 176. Price, 4.25 fr.  
*Humilité et Patience.* By Bishop Ullathorne, O.S.B. Pp. iv. 128. Price, 3.45 fr.

LONGMANS, London.

*God with us.* By Archdeacon E. J. Bodington, M.A. Pp. 59. Price, 2s. net.  
*Poetical Works of Andrew Lang:* Collected Edition. 4 Vols. Edited by Mrs. Lang. Pp. about 250 each. Price, 42s. n.

PFEIFFER & Co., Munich.

*Die Kirchlichen Wiedervereinigungsbewegungen der Nachkriegszeit.* By G. Pfeilschifter. Pp. 43.

ST. JOSEPH'S PRESS, Trichinopoly.

*English History, 1485-1920.* By J. H. Gense, S.J. Pp. 344. Price, 2s. 6d.

SANDS & Co., London.

*Beardless Councillors.* By Cicely Hallack. Pp. 320. Price, 7s. 6d. net.  
*Martinswood.* By Richard Ball. Pp. 318. Price, 7s. 6d. net.

SCOTT, London.

*The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology.* By Rev. J. S. Griffiths. Pp. 79. Price, 2s. 6d. net.

S.P.C.K., London.

*The Life of St. David.* By A. W. Wade-Evans. Pp. xx. 124. Price, 7s. 6d. net.

SOCIETY OF SS. PETER AND PAUL, London.

*Congress Books.* Various Numbers. Price, 3d. each.

TÉQUI, Paris.

*Connaitre, Aimer, Suivre la T. S. Vierge.* By Abbé J. Millot. Pp. 248. Price, 5.00 fr.

"TYROLIA" LIBRARY, Innsbruck.

*De Deo Operante.* By J. Stuffer, S.J. Pp. xx. 423.

